

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XIII

APRIL, 1928

No. 2

EDITORIAL

BIOGRAPHY AS A SPECIAL FIELD OF LITERATURE HAS OF late been engaging the attention of the critics. They have pointed out various classes of biographies, and someone has coined a new word to describe the particular type we are concerned with here. It is called a psychograph—a picture of the soul. As such it does not deal to any great extent with details in the career of its subject, save as these are necessary in delineating his inmost life and character and the influence he exerted upon his own and later times.

This word psychograph most aptly describes Principal McNicol's exceptional study of The Christianity of Pascal. Even before we are given the pertinent details of Pascal's early life, we are afforded a glimpse of the manner of man before us.

Clearly he is more interesting because of what he was than what he did, for we learn at the outset that Pascal's career exhibits that most unusual combination, a revolutionary and abiding spiritual experience along with intellectual achievements so brilliant that they alone would have given him a place among the world's thinkers.

After a suitable tribute to his subject's rare attain-

ments in the scientific world, Mr. McNicol passes to the account of his conversion, remarkable not only for its profound character, but also for its two distinct stages. Then come the results of this change, results so marked that Pascal's name is even more radiant in the annals of the faith than in the records of science.

The literary products of this man's brief Christian life were not numerous—simply the Provincial Letters, and the Thoughts—but they form no insignificant contribution to the literature of the Christian life, and are given deserved attention here.

Religion in our day is marked by the disposition to stress the intellectual at the expense of the spiritual, but here their harmonious relationship is seen to raise each to a higher plane. We have seldom published an article which, aside from its general attractiveness, was so peculiarly a message to the Christian leadership of these confusing times.

THE INTELLECTUALISM OF THE DAY HAS NOT ONLY tended to discredit the miraculous, but to explain away the redemptive work of Christ. The central feature of this work, our Lord's death on the cross, has been given an interpretation which hardly differentiates it from a soldier's death on the battlefield.

Turning from rationalistic speculation upon this event, even from Paul's exposition of its meaning, we may ask, How did Jesus Christ Himself regard His own death? It is to answer this that Dr. McCaig has written upon Christ's Teaching Concerning His Own Death. That he may not deal here with the subject at too great length, he confines himself to the light thrown upon it by the Synoptists only.

The first point considered is the fact that Christ

knew from the beginning that the cross awaited Him, a burden His soul may well have staggered under long before Simon of Cyrene relieved His bruised and weakened body. On this point Dr. McCaig quite properly notes the difference between Christ's knowledge and the revelation of that knowledge.

Then follows the stress our Lord laid upon His death, this emphasis itself a testimony to its importance. There is considerable apologetic significance in the inability of the disciples to accept the fact that their beloved Master must go to an ignominious death.

In bringing out the redemptive element, Dr. McCaig devotes several paragraphs to the exegesis of words in both Testaments signifying ransom and redemption, and in dealing with the typology of the Old Testament ritual and its fulfilment in this supreme event.

The argument moves steadily to establish the thesis, that Christ knew the vast meaning of Calvary to Himself and to mankind, and that no fair exposition of the Synoptic Gospels can make the death of Jesus Christ merely the tragic closing of a sublime and sacrificial life.

THE VERY WORD PHILOSOPHY SUGGESTS TO MOST FOLKS A kind of study that is "a weariness of the flesh." Yet, the demands of daily affairs excepted, there is no type of thinking which more persistently attracts the normal mind than philosophizing—instinctively endeavoring to solve the mysteries of life and of the universe.

Indeed, as Dr. Mullins shows us in *Humanizing Our Philosophy*, it is really impossible not to be a philosopher in some degree. In many things we must find reasons for our views and actions, since we are faced by the necessity of choice.

His comments on the universality of philosophy are

followed by a brief survey of its nature and purpose, the characteristics of various schools, and their personal backgrounds. "They are rarely, if ever, pure intellectual constructions." Here we are reminded of a similar observation by Dr. Wyckoff concerning the attitude of certain psychologists toward religion.

Then Dr. Mullins calls attention to the tendency of philosophical systems to cancel one another.

Few will want to put this delightfully written paper aside before it is finished, for, while brief, it is both comprehensive and searching. But the most significant and valuable feature is its consideration of the relation of personality to the problem of producing a stabilized philosophy, since "philosophy irresistibly tends to become human." The inadequacy of mechanism and behaviorism is made evident. There is no partiality shown for any particular school, but the intention is simply to point out "the irrepressible elements in human thought."

Of course such a line of reasoning of necessity brings into the field of philosophy the religious element, and this is freely recognized here, as in his closing paragraph where Dr. Mullins has this sentence, of no slight import to him who would construct for himself a satisfying philosophy: "Jesus Christ brings to man exactly those needed elements of thought which are lacking in the natural reason."

NOT LONG AGO A DEVOUT AND ABLE MINISTER REMARKED that a large proportion of the preachers in his region were "in it for the loaves and fishes." He also added that they laughed at all talk of saving souls and at all references to regeneration. The slight results of their ministerial work reflected their ideas.

To men of this type the whole idea of evangelism is

foolishness. They yearn for a delightful cultural atmosphere. Instead of summoning sinful men to repent and accept their Saviour, their pulpit work consists of essays, more or less instructive, and it also abounds in what a reviewer of a certain late book calls "cultural novelties." Concerning the author this reviewer further says, that "his theology is so vague that it defies classification."

Yet never has America, to look no farther, so greatly needed preaching that will drive home the truths that have ever distinguished Christianity and made it what it is. It is encouraging, then, when a man of Dr. Chown's standing and ability expresses himself as he has done in *The Springs of Evangelistic Power*.

There are many points in his paper that deserve most thoughtful attention on the part of every preacher, such as the keen appreciation of their own times by our pioneer evangelists, their concentration upon the deep needs of humanity, the free play of their strong personalities, the organization of their whole lives about the great purpose to save men, their personal spirituality and power.

But we must not anticipate further. Many a preacher who is honestly looking for the weaknesses in his own work, or who feels that uncertainty as to his course which often comes from sheer loneliness in following one's duty, may derive comfort, courage, and direction from Dr. Chown's fine account of those things which make the preaching of the Gospel what, above all else, it was designed to be.

IN OCTOBER, 1916, WE PUBLISHED IN THESE PAGES THE first of a series of articles by Dr. E. G. Sihler, upon

the conflict between early Christianity and pagan civilization. Cambridge University Press afterward sought the right to put these papers in book form, and they appeared in a volume entitled *From Augustus to Augustine*, which has found great favor among scholars in Great Britain and on the Continent, as well as on this side of the Atlantic.

A second series has followed, devoted more closely to New Testament times, and in this issue appears its closing article, *Nero and the Primitive Christians*.

Particular attention is paid to the reasons for the hatred shown toward the Christians, and also to the suspicions that fell upon them in connection with the great fire. This disaster brings up the character of Nero, which is presented from the descriptions which contemporaries have given us.

The persecutions of Christians are dealt with in a way to lead the reader to understand how difficult it was in the time of Nero for one to be an outright Christian without having to suffer for it. This sifting process naturally produced a lofty spiritual and moral type, as is apparent from the light thrown upon the character and customs of those early believers.

Numerous passages of the New Testament have a new interest as their allusions are made clear.

As usual, Dr. Sihler draws his material from the original sources, making his own translations from the authors involved. In this closing article of the series we have a group of pen pictures that not only renew but enlarge our knowledge of the brief span of history covered, and which have that accuracy and vividness possible only in the work of a scholar who has given his life to his task.

THE SUBJECTS COVERED BY THE BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS number are all of live interest today. The list includes:

Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.—*Moore.*

New Studies in Mystical Religion.—*Jones.*

Volts from a Layman's Dynamo.—*Magoun.*

Understanding the Apostles' Creed.—*McFayden.*

Our Jewish Neighbors.—*Conning.*

R. M. K.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF PASCAL

By JOHN McNICOL, Principal of the Toronto Bible College

THE SPIRITUAL experience of a great Christian saint enriches the life of the whole Christian church. When that experience is associated, as it was in the person of Blaise Pascal, with reasoning powers of the highest order and a mind intent on exploring truth to its ultimate source, then it is more than a contribution to the spiritual life. It is also an invaluable illustration of the essential truth of the Christian religion. This constitutes the peculiar significance of Pascal's faith. He was endowed with an eager scientific genius. His intellectual powers, says Macaulay,¹ "were such as have rarely been bestowed on any of the children of men." This supreme enquiring genius of his was first exercised in the realm of mathematics. When afterwards it entered the realm of religion it led him at last to the heart of Christianity.

I

The family of Pascal belonged to the Province of Auvergne, where for many generations they had held important positions under the French crown. Blaise was born at Clermont on the nineteenth of June, 1623. He had two sisters, Gilberte, three years older, and Jacqueline, two years younger, than himself. When he was eight years old, his father, who had become a widower, gave up his post and removed to Paris in order to devote himself to the education of his children. Being

¹ History of England, ch. vi.

a man of wealth and position, and taking a live interest in science, his home was marked by social culture and high thinking. In this atmosphere Blaise developed rapidly and gave early evidence of an uncommon mind. His elder sister, who has left an account of his life, says that as a child he was especially given to seeking explanations of things, that if the explanations he enquired for did not satisfy him he sought others for himself, and that he had always a remarkable clearness of mind in distinguishing the false from the true.

So pronounced was this scientific bent of his mind that his father, fearing that his literary and classical training might suffer, decided not to introduce him to the study of mathematics until the former had been completed. But the boy's eager mind could not be kept within bounds. When he was only twelve years old he discovered for himself the principles of geometry without the aid of a book by drawing figures upon the floor in an unused attic room. At sixteen he wrote a treatise on conic sections which astonished the incredulous Descartes and was read by Leibnitz a generation afterwards with amazement and delight. When scarcely nineteen he invented an arithmetical machine for making calculations in order to assist his father who had been appointed, in 1640, to an important fiscal office in Normandy. The Pascals were now living in Rouen, the capital of the province, where they remained for eight years, and there Blaise carried out a series of experiments by which he succeeded in solving the problem of the vacuum which had puzzled scientists for centuries.

These remarkable attainments gave young Pascal a place among the foremost scientists of Europe. They showed that he was possessed of extraordinary powers of sustained logical thought, combined with that clear

intuition which goes like a flash to the heart of a problem. Amid the most abstruse problems of mathematics his mind moved with the sureness and freedom of a bird on the wing. Up to this time he had taken no special interest in religion. It was not that he was irreligious, for he conformed to the rites of the church in which he was born. But his interests were wholly scientific. The truth that he sought was that which is attained by processes of reason. In these processes he took a keen delight, the delight of a hunter who tracks his quarry to the very end.

And Pascal never ceased to be a scientist. His most important mathematical discoveries were made after his interest in religion began. It was in the last years of his life, when his thoughts were most fully occupied with the study of Christian truth, that he accomplished what is regarded as his most notable mathematical achievement, the solution of the problems of the cycloid, the curve made by a fixed point on a wheel as it moves along the ground. It is clear, therefore, that Pascal did not abandon his scientific bent or lay aside the exercise of his reasoning powers when he became a Christian. On the contrary he carried them into the field of religion. Great as his scientific achievements were, it was to Christianity that the highest powers of his genius were devoted, and it was his Christian experience that called out the supreme activities of his incomparable mind.

Pascal's conversion took place in two distinct stages, separated by an interval of eight years. What is known as his first conversion occurred while the family were still in Rouen, and was marked by the overruling providence of God. One wintry day in 1646 the elder Pascal fell upon the slippery pavement and broke his thigh.

Two medical men were called in to attend him and remained in the household till a cure was assured. It happened that these men were Jansenists. They belonged to that movement which had recently arisen within the Roman Catholic Church in France and was attempting to revive primitive purity of doctrine and life. The outstanding features of Jansenism were, a doctrinal emphasis on the grace of God as the only means of salvation apart from any effort of man's nature, and a practical expression in a life of austere simplicity and devotion to God. The Pascals were impressed by the example and conversation of these men. They read the books which they brought to their attention and received a new conception of Christianity. It was the doctrinal consistency of Jansenism that appealed to Blaise especially. Its logical system satisfied him. Here was a religion, well knit together, which could be proved mathematically. He took to it, as he had taken to geometry, with the eager enthusiasm of a fresh discovery of truth. His ardent advocacy of it carried his father and his younger sister along with him. Even Gilberte who was now married and living at Clermont followed her brother's lead. The whole family became pronounced Jansenists.

This "first conversion" of Pascal, like that of Augustine, was more of the head than of the heart. It was not manifested in any change of life. In the following year he made a prolonged visit to Paris to consult physicians, for his health, which had been undermined by his excessive mental application, was steadily failing. He was accompanied by Jacqueline, and they attended the services of a Jansenist preacher attached to the community of Port-Royal whose simple and earnest sermons on human need and divine grace were

drawing crowds of eager worshipers. Both were deeply impressed and were more strongly confirmed in the views they had received from their Jansenist friends in Rouen. Jacqueline now made up her mind to withdraw from the world altogether and enter the convent of Port-Royal; but Blaise, while encouraging her in this purpose, went on with the life he was living and with his scientific labors.

The high society of Rouen had given him a taste for the world of culture, and when the family returned to Paris he allied himself with a number of persons who mingled worldly pleasure and social fellowship with philosophical and scientific pursuits. Pascal was now following a course of life imbued with the spirit of the world. His father died in September, 1651, and a few months afterwards Jacqueline carried out her purpose and became a recluse in the convent of Port-Royal. Blaise, on the other hand, sought an alleviation of his grief by giving himself up more and more to the fellowship of his friends. He was now known not only as a famous man of science, but also as an accomplished man of the world.

From her seclusion in Port-Royal Jacqueline looked with great concern upon what she regarded as her brother's worldly dissipations. It is true that the world possessed Pascal at this time, but never did he become dissolute or intemperate in his habits, and never was his character touched by any breath of scandal. His pleasures were those of the mind and of the human spirit. In the company of his friends the world of human nature opened up before him. The fellowship of society was the expression of it, and philosophy explored its principles. He read Epictetus and Montaigne. With the same ardent enthusiasm that he showed in the pursuit

of any object he had set his mind on, he gave himself up to the enjoyment of this world at its best, in the belief that truth was to be found and the ideal of life was to be realized in the culture of human nature.

The natural man had become for Pascal the chief end of life. At the same time his active mind took every occasion to advance the cause of science, and it was during this period of his life that some of his finest mathematical work was done. But his heart was not at rest. Behind all this worldly life of his was that longing for truth and certainty which was the dominant characteristic of his nature. He was ever seeking for reality, and it only eluded his search. His intellectual convictions left him cold and brought no peace to his soul.

At last there came a great revulsion. He was seized with a strong aversion for the world and the life he was living in it. He was sick in body, and his soul was ill at ease. He broke away from the society of his friends and withdrew into comparative retirement. Having failed to attain by processes of reason that assurance of God which he longed for, he sought it now by what he called the way of custom. He tried to produce it within his heart through the habitual rites and services of the church. He confided the state of his mind to Jacqueline, and she rejoiced in the prospect of a convert for Port-Royal. But the light he sought was to come neither by the effort of his reason nor by the formation of a habit. While he was in this state of mind he wrote a long and passionate prayer, and he had his answer in the great spiritual crisis of his life known as his second or final conversion.

Voltaire has accounted for the change which came over Pascal's life at this time as due to an accident which occurred on the bridge of Neuilly, when his horses

took fright and he was brought for a moment face to face with death. Others have taken up this suggestion and said that the shock to Pascal's feeble frame unsettled his nerves and agitated his mind to such an extent that he was never the same again, and that he regarded this event as a warning to break off all worldly engagements and live for God alone. This explanation is altogether inconsistent with the strength of Pascal's mind and with the character of his Christianity. It is no more reasonable than to refer the conversion of Saul of Tarsus to a sunstroke. Pascal himself does not mention the incident anywhere. His conversion was due to a cause far more profound and to an influence far more powerful.

The secret was discovered after his death in a piece of parchment which he had kept pinned over his heart. It was a record, quivering with life, of an experience he had on the night of Monday, the twenty-third of November, 1654. In a mystic vision of two midnight hours the light broke upon him, and he saw God revealed in Jesus Christ. The truth he had so earnestly sought he now found at last. He found it by an act of faith in Jesus Christ, and his heart was thrilled with the joy and certainty of the new discovery.

Pascal lived scarcely eight years after this event, but in that time the great scientist and man of the world became a great Christian saint. From those years come two unique pieces of Christian literature, both of which bear the stamp of his commanding intellectual genius, the *Provincial Letters*, and the *Thoughts*.

The occasion of the *Provincial Letters* was the controversy between the Jansenists of Port-Royal and the Jesuits over the question of divine grace. The Jansenists wished to put their case before the public, and

Pascal, who had been living in retirement at Port-Royal, was appealed to. He was not a theologian, but he knew what grace was. When the matter was explained to him he undertook to write something which the others could put into shape. In a few days he produced a letter, addressed to an imaginary friend in the provinces, describing the verbal quibbles of the Jesuits in their attack upon the teaching of the Jansenists. It was published at once under an assumed name and was an immediate success. It was followed by seventeen others at short intervals extending over fourteen months. In the course of these letters Pascal advanced from the subject of grace to an exposure of the system of casuistry on which the Jesuits based their moral teaching, addressing the last eight directly to the Jesuit fathers.

The Provincial Letters are marked by a refined wit, a delicate irony, and that easy and pellucid style which made Pascal the first and greatest master of French prose. But all this was used in the service of an incomparable logic. Pascal's reasoning is invincible. The same intellect which had attained its triumphs by its sustained logical precision in the realm of mathematics was now at work in the realm of spiritual and moral truth. Perhaps no other controversial work ever written is so devoid of personal passion. Nothing is overstated; nothing is misrepresented; nothing is said only for effect or for the temporary satisfaction of inflicting a wound. A deep and strong moral fervor pervades the letters, especially those which deal with the casuistry by which the Jesuits made religion a convenience and morals easy, but there is no emotional heat.

They exemplify Pascal's own account of eloquence: "So far as is possible we must keep to what is natural

and simple, not make great what is little, or little what is great. . . . It is not enough that a phrase be fine, it must suit the subject, and not have either excess or defect." (*Pensées*, Brunschvicg's ed., no. 16.) This principle, so scrupulously carried out, shows how sincere was Pascal's loyalty to truth. He adhered throughout to the four rules for reproof and controversy which he himself laid down in the first of the letters to the Jesuit fathers: To speak with truth and sincerity; to state only what is useful and not what can only hurt without conferring any benefit; if obliged to use ridicule, never to use it against holy things; and to have a heartfelt design of the salvation of those against whom we speak. The fact that the Jesuits had to give up their attempts to answer Pascal is not only an evidence of the completeness of his triumph; it is a tribute to the impregnable character of his intellectual honesty.

It was characteristic of Pascal, as showing the clearness of his mind and the reality of his spiritual experience, that in defending his Port-Royalist friends he did not allow himself to be betrayed into the extreme Jansenist position. The Jesuits regarded grace as so much divine assistance given to man to help the good that is in him to overcome the evil, a view which belittles the work of redemption. The Jansenists looked upon grace as operating upon the soul of man quite apart from the freedom and action of the human will, a view which belittles the nature of man. Pascal had an exalted conception of divine grace as the only hope for fallen man, but he had also a true understanding of the real greatness of man's nature as made in the image of God. He looked upon the will as holding the key position in Christian faith.

It is in the *Thoughts* that the genius of Pascal ap-

pears in its truly sublime and noble character. This work is made up of papers which were found in his room after his death, in bundles of all shapes and sizes and in no arrangement whatever. It is at once one of the most profound and one of the most unsystematic books ever written. Pascal had in mind the composition of an apologetic work for the purpose of proving the truth of Christianity to the freethinkers and men of the world who had been his companions before his conversion. He outlined his plan one day to a number of his friends, who sat listening with profound and wondering interest for two hours or more as he went on unfolding it with his characteristic logic and eloquence. It was of such a nature and scope as had never been attempted before. Sweeping aside the ordinary philosophic proofs, he placed his defense of Christianity on moral and historical grounds. He was the first apologist to see clearly the self-evidencing character of the Christian faith.

Pascal did not live to achieve his great design, but the materials he was collecting for it are contained in these unordered fragments on which he recorded his notes and reflections. He had a tenacious memory and never forgot anything that once occupied his attention. He would keep his thoughts in mind without writing them till they were mature, and then he would set them down, clean cut like minted gold, on any scrap of paper that lay at hand, and in language which his countrymen treasure as among the finest examples of their literature.

What Pascal intended to do with these notes, or how he would have arranged them, cannot be known. They were given to the world by Port-Royal in 1670, and they have been re-edited and republished in several different arrangements. In spite of their fragmentary

character they have such a breadth and strength, such a depth and repose, that they give an impression of finality. They never raise the suspicion of having been written with a theory in mind which they are put forward to support. They are the work of a solitary thinker cutting a straight path for himself to the heart of things.

The one key that unlocks them is the experience which marked his final conversion. He had been introduced that night into a new world, a world flooded with the light of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. His mind was now intent on exploring that revelation as he found it in the Scriptures. From the new point of view he surveys the world of human nature in which he had formerly lived. He finds man to be only a feeble reed in the universe, and yet a thinking reed. He sees him placed between two illimitable worlds, the infinitely little and the infinitely great, knowing himself capable of a high destiny and an eternity of bliss, yet finding himself entangled in a misery from which he cannot escape. Turning to the philosophies and religious systems of the world Pascal finds they give man no help. The only explanation of these strange contrarities is found in the Book which records man's fall from an original state of perfection and the interposition of God for man's salvation in the historic revelation of Jesus Christ.

In all this survey Pascal takes a wide sweep and explores many avenues of thought. Everywhere he proceeds with the same logical precision as in the Provincial Letters, while his penetrating insight and profound intuition appear on every page. Every line bears evidence of his deep reverence for the truth and his earnest effort to state it in its simplicity and complete-

ness. Not a grain of personal ambition can be found in all these fragments. The spirit which pervades them has enobled the life of multitudes by its richness and purity, and, by its sincerity and justness, has commanded the admiration of every type of mind. Samuel Johnson gave a copy of Pascal's *Thoughts* to his friend Boswell one Good Friday, and the garrulous biographer was sobered for the moment out of his usual complacency—"I preserve the book with reverence. . . . I have found in it a truly divine unction."²

This work is all the more remarkable in that it was written for the most part during great bodily suffering. The illness from which Pascal had suffered more or less since his early twenties grew worse after his thirtieth year. He moved about with great difficulty and only with the aid of crutches. The patience and fortitude with which he bore his sufferings give further evidence of the greatness of his soul and the extraordinary power of his mind. It was during a sleepless night, when he was diverting his mind from great bodily pain by reflecting on the curve of the cycloid, that he lit upon the idea which resulted in the discovery of its properties. His work on this subject was regarded as the greatest scientific effort of the human mind since Archimedes. His death occurred August 19, 1662, when he had only entered upon his fortieth year.

II

Pascal lived and died in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. It does not appear that he was ever in touch with any religious influence beyond it. His occasional references to Luther and Calvin do not give the impression that he had read these Reformers for himself. He

² Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ch. xlii.

represented their teaching in the light in which it was regarded around him. In this respect he was the child of his circumstances. He accepted the ecclesiastical order in which he found himself. This is not surprising when it is remembered that, while that order included the Jesuits, against whose perversion of Christian morals his whole soul rose up in abhorrence, it also included the Jansenists, from whom he had received his first abiding impressions of Christian truth.

Pascal's conception of Christianity, however, was wholly independent. He did his own thinking in the realm of religion as he did it in the realm of science, and in both spheres he refused to be satisfied till he had reached truth and certainty. The ecclesiastical order was the framework, but not the essence, of his Christianity. There are some passages in the *Thoughts* where his mind is fettered by rites and dogmas peculiar to Romanism; but the grand characteristic of his Christianity is the sense of reality which pervades it. Pascal is dealing with something above and beyond all ritual and all dogma, that essential and living thing which makes Christianity what it is, that which abides amidst all its changing forms. There are some things which modern Christianity may well learn from him.

1. The first thing which this man of supreme intellectual powers can teach us is, that the intellect is not sufficient of itself to lead us to the knowledge of God, and that its highest function is to minister to belief. Man by wisdom knows not God. The last step of reason is an act of faith. "The final attainment of reason is to recognize that there is an infinity of things which transcend it. It is only weak if it does not go on until it is aware of this. . . . We ought to know how to doubt where it is necessary, how to be assured where it

is necessary, and how to submit where it is necessary. He who does not do so does not understand the force of reason." (*Pensées*, Brunschvicg's ed., nos. 267, 268.)

Pascal has been charged by some writers with skepticism. It has been declared that the very groundwork of his mind was a universal skepticism from which he found refuge only in a blind faith, and that he built a chapel for faith upon the ruins of reason. This charge misrepresents his Christian position and is not made by any of those who are able to appreciate it. Alexander Vinet, the most sympathetic and understanding of all the students of Pascal, has well put it: "The Gospel is not given as a more vivid light added to our natural lights, but as a torch which has dispelled our darkness. The Christian faith does not lead to skepticism any more than it proceeds from it; and yet, rather than to say that skepticism made Pascal a Christian, it would perhaps be true to say, in a certain sense, that Christianity rendered him a skeptic."³

Pascal had discovered that, with Christianity left out, skepticism is the inevitable end of human thought. It is true that he was possessed with an unresting passion for certainty, and that this was so dominating in all his thinking that it surrounded him at times with an atmosphere of doubt and somberness. But this is not to say that he remained in that state. He reached certainty at last; and, although he did not reach it by the processes of reason, he reached it in a way which satisfied his reason. His mind, restless in its eager search for truth, came to rest at last in the truth which he found.

The ontological and metaphysical proofs of the being of God did not satisfy Pascal, and he did not use

³ *Etudes sur Pascal*, p. 237.

them. He knew their value and accepted them so far as they went. But he pointed out their difficulty and their uselessness for practical ends. "The metaphysical proofs of God are so remote from human reasoning and so complicated that they make but little impression upon us. . . . This sort of proofs can only guide to a speculative knowledge of God." (*Pensées*, Brunschvicg's ed., no. 543.) He saw that at best they are only abstract reasoning processes, and that they cannot bring the spirit of man into touch with reality.

There is a curious argument based on the laws of chance, which Pascal constructed for a betting friend of his at the time when he was working out the calculus of probabilities, which may illustrate the limitations of the reason. In every wager there are two things to consider, the number of chances and the importance of the gain or the loss. The reason for choosing such or such a side is expressed by the product of these two factors. Make as small as possible the chance that God exists—say only one—and as large as possible the number of chances that the world alone exists, which must be a finite number since there is one chance that God exists. Then consider the good which God can give, which must be infinite, and the good things which the world can give, which, no matter how great, are still finite. Now on the one side we have the one chance that God exists multiplied by the infinite good which God can give, making a product represented by infinity. And on the other side we have the number of chances that the world alone exists multiplied by the good things which the world can give, making a product which, however great it may be, is still less than infinity. The conclusion is clear, therefore, that man should lay his

bet on the chance that God exists; he should live for God and not for the world.

This reasoning is demonstrative; it has the precision of a geometrical proposition. But it makes no impression upon us. It may convince, but it cannot persuade. It may carry the judgment, but it does not move the will. Such is the limited effect of all discursive arguments. This is as far as reason can go in any method of proof.

But reason leads us to a place where faith should come into play, and faith is an act of the heart. And so it was that Pascal insisted on the right of the heart in reaching truth and reality. "We know truth not only by the reason, but also by the heart. It is by the latter we know first principles, which reasoning is not required to prove and in vain attempts to assail. . . . For the knowledge of first principles—such as that there is space, time, motion, number—is as certain as any of those which our reasonings supply to us, and it is on the knowledge of the heart and instinct that reason must rest and base all its discourse." (*Op. cit.*, no. 282.) By the heart Pascal means not the emotions alone, but the intuition and instinct of man's whole nature when thought, feeling, and will are all functioning together. Here he found the final ground of religious truth. "The heart has its reasons which the reason does not know; we know this in a thousand things." Thus the knowledge of God comes by the way of the heart, and is not an attainment of the reasoning powers. When reason has traveled as far as it can, the heart must still act. "It is the heart that is conscious of God, not the reason. This, then, is faith, God sensible to the heart, not to the reason." (*Op. cit.*, nos. 277, 278.)

But the act of faith which leads to the knowledge of

God does not mean the abandonment of reason. Having entered the new world which faith had opened to him, Pascal carried his reason with him, and in that revelation of the grace of God which he found in the Scriptures he had a larger field for the exercise of his intellectual powers than he ever had before. It was in His light that he saw light, and in that light he entered upon his true intellectual liberty. It was of the whole man, including the mental as well as the moral nature, that our Lord spoke when He said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

2. Pascal's experience also illustrates the fact, that the revelation of God to man is made through Jesus Christ. His search for the knowledge of God and for the sure and certain sense of His existence was baffled until his heart responded to the invitation of God in Jesus Christ. "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." This was the great significance of the final stage of his conversion.

The record of it was evidently penned before the freshness and warmth of that night's experience had passed. The document found upon his heart has preserved it in its original form. It is headed by the single word "Fire," and it is written in words of flame. Pascal had been meditating, it seems, upon the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel, for the Lord's high-priestly prayer breathes through his broken utterances. They all center upon the verse, "This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ," which occupies the middle of the paper. Under it, written twice across the page without comment, are the words "Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ." Through Him has come to Pascal's heart the knowledge of the Father whom the world has

not known, "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, not of the philosophers and wise men." This new light thrills his whole soul. He has found certainty and reality at last. "Certitude, certitude, feeling, joy, peace," he writes, "the God of Jesus Christ." He has found it "only by the way taught in the Gospel." The discovery overwhelms him with a sense of "the greatness of the human soul"; and again he writes, "Joy, joy, joy, tears of joy." But it also casts him down in grief and penitence for the sins that have separated him from the fountain of living waters. "I have fled from Him, denied Him, crucified Him." He makes a complete renunciation and a complete submission to Jesus Christ. And then the record closes with a quotation from his favorite Psalm, the 119th, "I will not forget thy words, Amen."

In reading this document one feels as if he were prying into secrets that were never intended to be known. Pascal no doubt wrote it for his own use only, that he might have some record of the most important moment in his life. It is the record of a great soul that has just passed from darkness into light, and finds itself in the presence of ultimate reality. It is not the cool certainty of the intellect convinced by argument, nor it is the utterance of an emotion unreasoning and uncontrolled. The whole soul of the man has been called out; mind, heart, and will are all functioning in the experience of those hours. In the transaction of that night his heart, in the full sense in which Pascal himself uses the word, opened to Jesus Christ as He is presented in the Gospel; and, instead of the philosophical abstraction which was all that his reason had ever been able to reach, he found the living God revealed. In Christ God had come home to his heart.

The truth which Pascal discovered that night appears again and again in the *Thoughts*, and he carries it along its logical issues: "We do not know God except by Jesus Christ. Without this Mediator all communication with God is taken away; by Jesus Christ we know God. All those who have pretended to know God and to prove Him without Jesus Christ had but impotent proofs. Not only do we not know God except by Jesus Christ, but we do not know ourselves except by Jesus Christ; we know not life nor death except by Jesus Christ. . . . Thus, without Scripture, which has only Jesus Christ for its object, we know nothing, and see only obscurity and confusion in the nature of God and in our own." He goes even farther than this: "Jesus Christ is the object of everything, and the center to which everything tends. He who knows Him knows the reason of all things." (*Pensées*, Brunschvicg's ed., nos. 547, 548, 556.)

These words are to be understood in the light of that "infinity of things" which Pascal recognized above and beyond the reach of reason. Just as the philosophic conception of God by itself is not the knowledge of God, so the scientific conception of the world by itself is not the knowledge of the world. It does not go far enough. It is only when the scientific conception which has been attained by reasoning processes is carried on into the light of the revelation of God in Christ that we arrive at a true understanding of this world and of our place in it. That knowledge comes only when the scientist bows with reverent faith before Him "without whom was not anything made that hath been made."

Here again the highest function of the intellect is to minister to faith. Even in a true knowledge of the world faith must come into play. Faith opens the door

to the unseen world which lies above and beyond the natural. "By faith we understand that things which are seen were made out of things which are not seen."⁴ The Biblical writers did not have a scientific view of the world, but neither did they have an unscientific view. They described the world as they saw it, as men of common sense do when they look out upon it; but when they came to explanations of phenomena they swept all second causes by and went straight to the center of things. They attributed all the activities of nature to the direct action of God. In doing so did they not show a very true knowledge of the world? That explanation of the universe which stops with a scientific conception, however correct it may be, is not so true. It must still wait upon faith to open the door to the reality. If we are to believe that "in him were all things created, . . . and in him all things consist," then the universe is the expression of His mind and the laws of nature are the operation of His will, and Pascal's words have a profound significance, "He who knows Him knows the reason of all things."

3. A third thing which Pascal teaches us is, that the fundamental principle of practical Christianity is the death of self. He saw clearly that the essence of sin consists not in a conflict of two opposing tendencies in man's nature, but in the very attitude of that nature, the enthroning of self in the center of the being as the law of existence. "Self is to be hated," he repeatedly declared. "It makes itself the center of everything. I will always hate it." (*Op. cit.*, nos. 455, 476.) He understood the deep and searching significance of the Master's command, "If any man would come after me

⁴ Heb. 11:3, Syriac Version.

let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."

He had come to realize this not only by his interpretation of the teaching of Christ, but also by his utter failure to find peace and satisfaction through the cultivation of self and the refinement of human nature. This was the guiding principle of the society to which Pascal for a time had devoted himself. His friends of those days were people of education and good breeding, whose code was that of good manners, who found pleasure not merely in pleasing themselves but also in the pleasure of others. This was their religion, and the cult of the beautiful in conduct differs little from it. It was from this kind of life that Pascal turned away with aversion. His keen sense of the genuine and the real, which was ever separating the false from the true in all that came before his notice, discovered the illusion of this form of culture. It was not that sin was being carried to the extreme, but the stamp of egoism was upon it all. Its controlling principle was really self-love, and even in its highest and best expression this could produce only a deep unrest.

With his final conversion Pascal came into the heart of the Christian experience and saw that Christianity's way of dealing with self is, not to cultivate it but to repress it and count it a dead thing. And he did not shrink from the implications of the cross. It is true that his method of putting this principle into practice was affected by his ecclesiastical associations. He submitted to the rigorous discipline of Port-Royal although he did not become a member of the community. He subjected himself to menial tasks and ascetic habits, and even wore a girdle of steel points which he would strike with his elbow whenever he felt the self rising within him. But

all this with Pascal was no mere mortification of the body; it was a real attempt to humble and purify his spirit. He did not regard these practices in the light of personal merit, but simply as a means of reminding him continually that he was identified with a crucified Lord, and that the old nature, the self in which sin has its seat, having been put to death on the cross, is to be perpetually kept there. His piety may have had a medieval aspect, but his thoroughgoing Christianity is a rebuke to our modern softness.

The effect upon his character was quite marked. By nature he was somewhat imperious and headstrong. The peculiar vivacity of his mind would sometimes make him irritable and impatient with others. But this disposition gave place at last to a singular meekness and humility. His deep love for the Saviour pervades the Thoughts like an aroma; it is especially manifest in the remarkable fragment called *The Mystery of Jesus*. He had also a tender concern for the poor. In their interest he helped to establish the first public omnibus in Paris. Two years before his death he sold his carriage and horses, his fine furniture and plate, and gave all the proceeds away. If his wish had been carried out, in his last illness he would have been taken to the hospital to die among them. His last six weeks were spent in his sister's home, and there her children witnessed the triumph of grace in the sufferings of a great soul.

In his recognition of the death of self as the underlying principle of Christian character Pascal anticipated by a century the teaching of William Law, whom Dean Inge⁵ regards as "one of the most powerful and virile minds that the Church of England has ever produced." Law's last book, published in 1761, the year of his death,

⁵ The Expository Times, October, 1926, p. 21.

was An Humble, Earnest, and Affectionate Address to the Clergy, and contains a powerful statement of this truth. He makes it clear that the denial of self which Christ requires of His disciples is vastly more than self-sacrifice. "Our salvation," he says, "consists wholly in being saved from ourselves, or that which we are by nature. In the whole nature of things nothing could be this salvation or saviour to us but such an humility of God manifested in human nature as is beyond all expression. . . . Self is the whole evil of fallen nature; self-denial is our capacity of being saved; humility is our saviour."⁶ Law goes on to show how this salvation is accomplished only by the power of the Holy Spirit, and how the supreme business of the minister of the Gospel is to bring to pass the rebirth of the Spirit of God in the souls of men.

It was just in this aspect of the truth that Pascal came short. Clearly as he saw the negative element in a true spiritual experience, he did not fully understand the corresponding positive element. Fully as he sought to exemplify the crucifixion of self in his union with Christ, he did not clearly realize how this is achieved and how the fulness of life is supplied by the Spirit of the risen Christ. He did not quite attain to the glorious liberty of the children of God. But this limitation of his Christianity is to be attributed, not so much to his own conception of it, as to the ecclesiastical system to which he belonged.

Pascal's work should ever remind us that the highest use of our intellectual powers is to be found in the devout exploration of the revelation which God has given to man in Jesus Christ. The critical and philosophical approach to Christianity which has occupied so much of

⁶ Andrew Murray's ed., p. 81 f.

the thinking of the church during the past generation has its value, but it can go no farther than the outer courts. Of how much greater value is that devotional and exegetical approach which enters into the inner sanctuary of the Scripture revelation and summons all the resources of the human mind to the reverent study of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There can be no higher science than this. It is the occupation of those pure intelligences in the Heavenly places unto whom the manifold wisdom of God is being displayed through the operation of His redeeming grace on earth.⁷ The mightiest mind among the apostles dwelt in the constant contemplation of it. It evoked from his heart, in the midst of the profoundest of his Epistles, his wondering and adoring praise: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments and his ways past tracing out! . . . For of him and through him and unto him are all things. To him be the glory for ever. Amen." (Rom. 11:33-36.)

⁷ Eph. 3:10.

CHRIST'S TEACHING CONCERNING HIS OWN DEATH

By DR. A. McCAIG, Principal Emeritus of Spurgeon's College, London

WE COULD not expect the full significance of the death of Christ, even if considered simply as a historic event, to be unfolded until after it had taken place; but if it had, as we believe, a place in the purpose of Christ, we should expect to find some reference to it in His teaching. His teaching as recorded in the Gospel of John has many full, definite, and illuminative references to His death, but even in the Synoptics there is enough to show the importance of that death; and it is our purpose, in this paper, to examine only the Synoptic witness, as space limitations would not admit of our considering the fuller testimony of John. For convenience' sake we may follow chiefly the guidance of Matthew, noticing the other two only where they supply additional particulars.

The first distinct reference to Christ's death is given in Matthew 9:15, when, in answer to the question of John's disciples concerning fasting, He says, "Can the children of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?" High is the place that He assigns to Himself in this illustration. His presence is the source of joy and satisfaction to His disciples; with Him they lack nothing and have no need to mourn or to exhibit the outward tokens of mourning. "But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." How He is to be taken He does not suggest, but inasmuch as the event is to be

the cause of mourning it could hardly be anything else than death that is meant.

It has been frequently asserted that Christ did not in the early part of His ministry expect death, but contemplated establishing a kingdom apart from the cross, and that only gradually, and towards the end of His ministry, did it dawn upon Him that the cross was a necessity. This idea is refuted by the whole of John's Gospel, but this passage is sufficient to show that, even on the representation of the Synoptics, His death was before His mind at an early stage of His ministry. We may well admit that it was only in the later stages of His ministry that He made full disclosure of it to His disciples, and it was long then ere they grasped the idea. Indeed they never seem willingly to have entertained the thought of His death until it had actually occurred. But Christ's knowledge of His death must not be confounded with His revelation of it.

In the next chapter, when, as recorded, He sends forth the twelve, He warns them that they must expect persecution because He, their Master had to meet the same. In His speaking of the possibility of losing their lives for His sake there is the implication that He is to lose His own life, for the loss of their lives is to come through fellowship with Him; while there is also a hint of the manner of the death in the exhortation about taking up the cross and following after Him.

In His answer to the Pharisees who seek a sign He declares the sign of Jonas will be the only sign given, which sign derives all its meaning from its representation of His death and resurrection: "So shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

The memorable conversation at Caesarea Philippi

is luminous in its bearing upon the doctrine of the personality of the Saviour, and it is very significant that what was the first full and explicit declaration concerning Himself to His disciples, as recorded by the Synoptics, should be followed by a full and explicit statement concerning His sufferings and death. We may well conclude from this, that a full understanding of Himself and His mission is impossible apart from a consideration of His death. These are the words of Matthew: "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." There had been but hints before, now He shews them in plain terms; or, as Mark puts it, "He spake the saying openly." It also seems from the phrase, "From that time forth began Jesus to shew," that He frequently afterwards mentioned the matter, more frequently, we may well suppose, than has been recorded.

There is also a significance in the juxtaposition of the two declarations, that concerning His person and concerning His death. It was only after some preliminary teaching and after having some knowledge of Him and fellowship with Him, that the disciples were prepared for the definite announcement of His Messiahship, or, to put it another way, as it was only after He had by words and works laid a sure foundation for the claim to Messiahship, that He now openly avows it; so also it is only after that definite avowal is made, only after the disciples receive the full revelation of His Messiahship, that He proceeds clearly to show that His Messiahship involves rejection, shame, suffering, death.

And that the death, with all that leads up to it, is no incidental or accidental matter, but is inseparably bound

up with His Messianic destiny, is clearly shown by His stern reply to Peter who, perhaps unduly exalted by the warm commendation just given him, had presumed to rebuke Christ, saying, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee," for Christ said, "Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Great had been His joy at Peter's confession of His divinity, and hearty was the commendation which He gave him; but equally great is His abhorrence of this anti-cross suggestion, and equally strong is His condemnation of His foolish disciple. The confession He had declared to be Spirit taught; the suggestion He now declares to be of Satanic and fleshly prompting. If we had no other word of Christ on the subject this would be enough to show how important and essential a place His sufferings and death occupied in His thought and purpose.

Following upon this utterance we have words similar in tone to those noted in the tenth chapter concerning cross-bearing and losing of life for His sake, indicating that, because by the way of the cross and death the Master went, that way the servant still must tread.

He then speaks of the coming of the Son of man in the glory of His Father, to execute judgment. A statement which again implies that He, the Son of man, must first go away, and that by the gloomy path already indicated; but the gloom is to melt into the glory, and He who is rejected and put to shame and death by the dignitaries of this world will appear in glory surpassing all that earth can show and will occupy the eternal throne.

The immense importance attaching to the conversation at Caesarea Philippi and the statements growing

out of it is shown by the fact that all three Evangelists report it, and each in such a way as to show that it was felt to be a very special pronouncement. It seemed indeed to signalize a crisis in the life of the Saviour, when, having to some extent fulfilled His mission as a prophet and told of His kingship, He turns His face towards Calvary and points His disciples to the great priestly work to which all else led up. This crisis was still more definitely marked by the great event which took place a week later—the Transfiguration.

It has frequently been noted that the testimony borne to Christ by the voice from Heaven on the mount bears the same relation to His sufferings and death as the Heavenly witness at His baptism bears to His ministry. That the Transfiguration is linked very definitely with the coming tragedy is shown, not only by its close association, in the Evangelists' record, with the disclosure at Caesarea Philippi, but also by the words of Christ to His disciples as they descended the mountain. He charged them saying, "Tell the vision to no man, till the Son of man be risen from the dead." That Transfiguration glory is but a prelude to the glory that shall be His after His resurrection. But the Resurrection implies the death, and the whole matter is beyond the grasp of the disciples, and the way in which they puzzle over it shows that they had not understood His former statements. They bring to Him their difficulty about Elias, and in explaining the prophecy by applying it to John the Baptist, whose fidelity had been rewarded by the enmity of men, He adds simply and plainly, "Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them"; in the fuller report of Mark He showed, "how it is written of the Son of man that he shall suffer many things and be set at nought." It seems somewhat

strange that Luke says nothing of this conversation, though we find it is implied in the statement that, "they kept it close and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen." The explanation of such reticence can be found only in the injunction of the Master as recorded by Matthew and Mark.

But Luke has, in his account, a very definite reference to the predicted death, and his omission of the remarks given by the others, is amply compensated for by his solitary report of the most significant fact, that this coming death formed the subject of conversation between Christ and the two shining ones, "who . . . spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." The word is "exodus" (Greek, *ἐξόδος*), and there may be seen in the death thus described a reference to that grandest event in the history of God's ancient people, which gives the name to the second book of the Bible. It at once suggests that the death of Christ would bear an analogous relation to the history of His people.

This is made the more likely by the peculiar phrase, "the exodus which he should accomplish." If it had simply been the exodus which He should obtain or enjoy, it might have been considered as purely personal; but this *accomplishing*, so unusual in connection with a man's own death, gives the idea that it was to be a work done, a victory won by Himself, not simply a doom suffered at the hands of men, a work to be as really effected by His own grace and power as any of the miracles accomplished by Him in His life. But the mere act of dying could hardly be a victory, far less a work performed by Him. We never speak of a man accomplishing His own death except indeed in the unnatural sense of committing suicide. And certainly

Christ's death, considered merely as the ending of His personal life, was anything but a victory; but if that death is regarded as securing the exodus, the deliverance, the redemption of His people out of condemnation into favor, out of bondage into liberty, out of death into life, out of a world of sin into a land of fadeless immortality, then there is special point in calling it a triumphant exodus.

Soon after the Transfiguration, we find Jesus again speaking definitely of His approaching death. He had healed the demon-possessed boy when the disciples had been utterly baffled, and this seems to have led them to talk with great admiration of His surpassing power; but, just while their thoughts are occupied with His greatness, He utters the word which shows how differently His thoughts were occupied, "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men: and they shall kill him and the third day he shall be raised again." Luke introduces his report of the words with the pregnant remark, "While they wondered every one at all things which Jesus did, he said unto his disciples, Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men." He thus showed how much importance He attached to the utterance, and it is almost suggested that this matter of His dying was something more wonderful than any of these other things about which they thought so much.

In this great saying there is a further advance, inasmuch as He indicates the fact of His betrayal. Still the disciples fail to understand Him; they are bewildered and troubled, but they are not enlightened. "They were exceeding sorry," Matthew says. "They understood not that saying and were afraid to ask him," says Mark, and, with still more particularity,

Luke declares, as if wishing to give all possible emphasis to the fact, "But they understood not this saying, and it was hid from them that they perceived it not: and they feared to ask him of that saying." So utterly did they fail to understand the significance of the words, so resolutely did they refuse to let the saying dislodge their preconceived ideas of His Kingdom, that presently they fell to disputing among themselves who should be the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. This, to us, strange conduct not only proves their lack of understanding of their Master's words, but serves in great measure to account for it. They were so thoroughly possessed with the idea of a temporal kingdom that they could find no room in their minds for the strange new thought, that their King was to suffer and die.

This preconception and misconception of theirs may at least serve the good purpose of proving that the New Testament idea of the work of Christ and the nature of His Kingdom was not a native growth from the minds of a few enthusiastic and visionary Jews. The wish certainly, in their case, could not be father to the thought. It was only the stern logic of facts which convinced them eventually of the true character of the Messiah's Kingdom.

Ere long the time comes for the last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and on the way Jesus again speaks to the disciples of the subject which fills His heart. Matthew tells us that He took the twelve disciples apart in the way before making the disclosure to them. Mark says practically the same thing, but he prefaces it with one of those vivid dramatic touches which abound in his Gospel, "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed they were afraid." Mani-

festly He hastened His steps in His eagerness, and the expression of His countenance showed His lofty resoluteness, the great gladness of His consecration, perhaps also the awfulness, the horror, of the fate to which He was committed; so that wonder and alarm were the feelings excited in the hearts of the disciples. Luke uses a somewhat similar expression, in describing part of this same journey, if not this particular stage of it, "When the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," the word perhaps implying the resolute overcoming of some natural shrinking from the awful ordeal, just as in the garden subsequently, while there was the human shrinking, there was the deliberate acceptance of the cross with all that it involved.

Aptly has Cowper expressed the thought, conveyed by these descriptions, in the well-known lines:

The Saviour, what a noble flame
Was kindled in His breast,
When, hasting to Jerusalem,
He marched before the rest.

Good-will to man and zeal for God
His every thought engross;
He longs to be baptized in blood,
He pants to reach the cross.

With all His sufferings full in view,
And woes to us unknown,
Forth to the task His Spirit flew;
'Twas love that urged Him on.

With such a prelude His words might well come with peculiar force and emphasis, and certainly even to us now they sound most impressive; like the muffled peals of a funeral bell the mournful phrases fall upon the ear, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem: and the Son of

man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes: and they shall condemn him to death: and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge and to crucify him." Mark supplies another doleful detail of the degradation, which Luke also gives, "and they shall spit upon him." But in all three reports He ends with the triumphant note, "and the third day he shall rise again."

It is remarkable how vividly every part of the sad transaction stands out before His mental vision. He could not have been surprised at the subsequent course of events. He mentions now for the first time the exact manner of His death, in which its crowning horror, from the human standpoint, lay—crucifixion.

Still, however, the dull disciples are unable to follow His thought. Luke again, struck with their unappreciative attitude, gives as the reason, "They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." And, as on the former occasion, they presently show how utter is their lack of apprehension. The mother of James and John comes with her sons to Jesus, appearing in a most becoming attitude, for she worships Him, and begs a favor as from a king. But her petition, with which James and John must have agreed, shows that the true idea of His Kingdom is yet sadly lacking, and the vision of the sufferings and death, like a dissolving view, has speedily given place to the dazzling picture of the glorious Kingdom for which they longed. Christ, however, treats the suppliants with wondrous patience and gentleness, taking the opportunity of still further pointing the lesson of His coming sufferings, "Ye know not what ye ask; are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the

baptism that I am baptized with?" Their confident answer only shows how little they knew of the matter, while Christ's reply to it lifts the curtain of the future more fully and reveals the fact, that His faithful followers must indeed expect, in some measure, to share in His sufferings; but it still leaves the impression that His experience will be unique and that He is called to endure more than any other would be able to bear.

The ten, hearing of this, are angry with the two brethren, because they have tried to steal a march upon them, but their very displeasure shows that they as little as the other two had entered into the meaning of the prediction of the passion. Jesus in settling the dispute takes the opportunity of laying down the great law of service in His Kingdom as determining the place of honor, and illustrates and enforces it by showing that its greatest exemplification was to be found in His own mission, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," His ministry, however, passing into the great act of sacrifice of which all other acts of self-sacrifice on the part of His people would be but a faint reflection, "and to give his life a ransom for many." Here then Christ gives a very clear intimation of the purpose and meaning of His death; and in this pregnant statement lies the germ of all the apostolic teaching on the redemptive work, "to give his soul a *ransom* for many."

The word used is simple and bears a well established meaning, and it is accurately rendered by our "ransom," a price paid to secure the freedom of a slave or the release of a possession from liabilities and charges, and generally to deliver from any calamity by paying the forfeit. The word *λύτρον* was a common enough one in Greek classical literature, constantly bearing the sense

of ransom-price, and was frequently connected, in ritual usage, with sacrifice, expiation.¹

But for the full explanation of our Lord's great thought we have to look to the Old Testament usage. The two leading verbs, translated in our version, "to redeem," are in Hebrew *gaal* and *padah*, generally rendered in the LXX by λυτρόω; and derivatives of these words, conveying the idea of actual price paid, are translated by this very word λύτρον.

In Exodus 21:30, *e.g.*, we have the law concerning the case of a person killed by an ox; the ox was to be killed, and the owner of the ox was liable to death, but the provision was made, "If there be laid upon him a sum of money, then he shall give for the *ransom* of his life whatsoever is laid upon him." The Hebrew word for "a sum of money" is *kopher*, literally, "atonement"; and for "ransom," *pidyon*, a means of deliverance (from *padah*). The Septuagint renders both by λύτρα. "If there is laid upon him λύτρα he shall give as λύτρα of his soul whatever is laid upon him." (*Cf.* Lev. 25:24-26, 51, 52; 27:31; wherever in English you have "redemption," "redemption-price," the Greek has λύτρα.)

But perhaps the most important passage is the law concerning the half-shekel to be paid by every Israelite from twenty years and upward when any census was taken. It was to be the same for rich and poor, and it was called "atonement-money," "to make atonement for their souls." In the opening words of the law, as given in Exodus 30:12, we read, "They shall give every man a *ransom* for his soul unto the Lord." The Hebrew is

¹ The familiar verb λύω is the root, "to loose, to set free"; then λύτρον, that which secures the freedom, "the payment or forfeit"; then the cognate verb, λυτρόω, "to set free upon payment of a ransom, to redeem"; λύτρωσις, the actual setting free, "redemption"; λυτρωτής, "redeemer." The favorite New Testament word for redemption is the compound form, ἀπολύτρωσις.

kopher; the Greek is λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, "a ransom price of his soul." The whole people were thus considered as doomed and needing atonement, and it is significant that this atonement-money paid at the first census furnished the silver for the sockets of the tabernacle boards. The typical tabernacle was thus founded upon atonement.

The same thought, that the people's lives were forfeited, comes out in the provision for the consecration of the Levites recorded in full in Numbers 3:40-51. The firstborn represented the people; God claimed all the firstborn as forfeited to Himself, teaching that Israel deserved the same punishment as that which fell on the Egyptians, and were only spared by the grace of God in virtue of the sprinkled blood. Now He takes to Himself for His service, as the equivalent of the firstborn, the Levites, and when it is found that the number of the firstborn exceeds the number of the Levites, the equivalence is maintained by ransoming at a certain price the surplusage of the firstborn males. In the Septuagint account λύτρα occurs four times, twice for the phrase, those to be redeemed, and twice for redemption-money. Thus the idea of ransom for the forfeited life became a basal one in the thoughts of God's people, as educated by the typical system, and redemption expressed the sum total of their hopes for the future, however faulty might be their conception of its nature.

The prophetic testimony also gave prominence to the thought of redemption. The Coming One was to be Redeemer; redemption was to be the work of the Messiah. The redemption of the soul, the typical economy clearly taught, is to be by sacrifice; but the people seem to have looked for that to God alone through the observance of their ritual, while redemption, in the more external sense of deliverance from all enemies and

troubles, they linked with the advent of the Messiah; and it required a spiritual vision to see that the two things would coincide, that the Messiah would effect redemption in all its phases and fulness by means of ransom, of sacrifice, of expiation.

Christ appeared as the Messiah in whom all the Old Testament was to be fulfilled. He knew perfectly the meaning of the typical and prophetic testimony, which His disciples, taught by Him and by the light of actual events, afterwards elucidated for the instruction of the church. But even at this time it was clear as sunlight to Him, and with that fully in view, and knowing that His death was to fulfil the Old Testament types and accomplish its brightest prophetic anticipations, He deliberately uses this term "ransom" to describe it.

The relation of λύτρον in the Old Testament, incidentally noted, to sacrifice also gives special force to the words of Christ. As I have said, the Greeks connected the two ideas in their conceptions, and so, very definitely, did the Jews. The word *kopher* above mentioned comes from *kaphar*, to cover, which is, in the Piel form, the most common and technical word in Hebrew for making atonement or expiation or propitiation, and is frequently rendered by the Greek ἱλάσκειν or its compound, ἐξιλάσκειν. In Exodus 21:30 it is used interchangeably with *pidyon*, and both are represented in the LXX by λύτρα, as is *kopher* in other passages. The relation is well expressed by the late Principal Gracey when, in summing up his valuable discussion of the word *kaphar*, he says: "The full idea of redemption is not a mere release, but a release obtained through the payment of a ransom. And, as in the case of sin, sacrifice was the only covering or atonement, so also sacrifice was the only ransom. It was the same Divine Justice that re-

garded the sacrificial covering that also received the sacrificial ransom." Christ, therefore, in conceiving of His death as a ransom, in the same conception regarded it as a sacrifice, an expiatory offering.

The strong preposition used intensifies the idea of ransom and expiation, even to the point of substitution, *ὑπέρ*, "on behalf of," is frequently used in connection with the death of Christ, and those who deny the expiatory and substitutionary nature of His sufferings will have it that it is used in a loose, general way, "for the benefit of." But here the preposition is *ἀντί*, and "instead of" is its proper rendering; and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution, cannot be removed from it. In Numbers 3:45, "Take the Levites *instead of* the firstborn," the Septuagint uses *ἀντί* which like the English "instead of" exactly represents the Hebrew *takhath*, and all three convey most unmistakably the idea of substitution. As the Levites were to be substituted for the firstborn, so for the surplus of the firstborn, the "ransom money" was to be substituted, that idea, however, being clearly enough indicated by the genitive. Indeed, the more appropriate, and the simpler, way of describing a ransom would be with the genitive—the ransom *of* many, or, as our version renders, "a ransom *for* many"; but just because the ransom here is not a mere money payment, but is the actual sacrifice of the life, the substitution of His soul, He is appropriately said to "give his soul a ransom *instead of* many."

The importance of this great utterance must be our apology for dwelling so long upon it, and we have left much unsaid about it.

The next reference to the coming death is contained in the parable of the vineyard, in which it is shown that men will kill God's Son and heir, and that the King-

dom of God will in consequence be transferred to the Gentiles.

In the parables of Matthew 24 and 25 the death, though not mentioned, is implied in the coming again of the Son of man, and it is plainly hinted in Luke's parable of the nobleman going into the far country; but in Matthew 26 we again find a clear declaration, "Ye know that after two days is the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified." While His enemies are plotting to bring about His death, the anointing at Bethany takes place, when Christ, in justifying and commending the extravagance of Mary's love, affirms, "For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial." Mark says, "She is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying." The death, implied by the burial, is still uppermost in His thoughts, and it would seem from the statement that Mary had some idea of it also. I do not think it fully explains the words to say that Jesus accepts her deed as equivalent to the anointing for burial, thus reading into it for Mary's benefit a meaning that she had not in her mind. I think the words show what was Mary's own real intention. Nor is it greatly to be wondered at that, in view of His oft repeated intimation of an approaching violent death, she should have believed that it was really about to take place. She had not been thinking of place and power in the Kingdom; she had been thinking only of her Lord, and His words had been treasured up in her heart, and now with the intuition of love she desires to perform for Him an office which may otherwise in the coming turmoil be neglected or found impossible. Taking this view, the words of Jesus appear all the more appropriate and significant.

The next great utterance is given in connection with

the institution of the Lord's Supper. Here again the thought of Christ is best approached through the Old Testament teaching. There can be no doubt that the Supper is in some way related to the Passover. He who had called His death an exodus institutes a feast which is to take the place of the old Paschal feast, which commemorated the ancient exodus, and the full significance of the Supper can be felt only in the light of the Jewish Passover. By the sprinkling of the blood of the slain lamb, the covenant into which God entered with His ancient people was ratified; and that which as a sacrifice averted the doom to which they had been exposed was also given to them to feed upon, thus symbolizing communion with God and nourishment of the divine life, as the sprinkled blood of the victim, upon the lintels and doorposts, betokened atonement and shelter from the avenger.

With all this typology full in view Christ prepares to eat the Passover with His disciples, and, in instituting His memorial feast, He says, "This is my body," "given for you," "take eat," thus showing the significance of His death. "Given" tells of surrender unto death; "for you" proclaims the sacrificial and substitutionary character; while the eating of the symbolical body tells of the nourishment which communion with Him affords. In passing the cup the words He uses are still more emphatic, "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The "new covenant" suggests comparison and contrast with the old covenant. The old covenant was symbolically based upon and ratified by the Passover, but there is also a reference to the subsequent ratification of the covenant recorded in Exodus 24:8, when Moses, after reading the words of the Lord which had been written in the

book of the covenant, and having received the formal assent of the people to its requirements, took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." There is evidently a reference as well to the great passage in Jeremiah 31 about the promised new covenant. Both these passages were afterwards expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is clearly shown that Christ's death filled up the shadowy outline of the old covenant and was the basis of the new, and we cannot but believe that this was fully intended by the words of Christ here.

The additional statement, that His blood was shed for the remission of sins, makes it still more evident. The blood of the old covenant typically and figuratively procured forgiveness for the people through the shedding of Christ's blood; the new covenant is ratified and perfect forgiveness is actually secured for His people—not Jews alone, but "for many."

The words are so plain that only a mind filled with prejudice or preconceived theories could fail to apprehend the meaning, to see that in some way, at least, the death of Christ was to procure forgiveness, that this was indeed His purpose in dying, and not a mere incidental or mysterious and inexplicable effect. Nothing less than atoning, vicarious, redeeming efficacy is thus attributed to the blood of Christ. It is, indeed, very noteworthy that the atoning virtue is not attributed to the teaching, the example, the influence, of Christ, but to His death, His shed blood. It is hard to see how any theory of the Atonement which sets aside the true expiatory character of the death of Christ can be reconciled with these words.

Rising from the supper table, Christ says, "All ye

shall be offended because of me this night, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad"—another proof of the way in which His mind was saturated with Old Testament truth. That prediction of Zechariah is one of the most remarkable and, apart from the light of the cross, one of the most mysterious of the Messianic prophecies. The Shepherd is Jehovah's fellow, His equal, and yet He is to be smitten by God; and while the first result is the scattering of the sheep, as Christ here indicates, the permanent and blessed outcome will be the turning of Jehovah's hand upon the little ones. The smiting of the Shepherd and the consequent saving of the little ones, point to the same circle of ideas as the former passages, expiation, substitution, salvation.

In the briefest manner we note, as completing the Synoptist testimony, the utterances of Christ after the Resurrection, when the death with all it involved was now an accomplished fact, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?" The sufferings were a necessary prelude to the glory; the glory was the necessary consequence of the sufferings. And Christ's glory means the mediatorial glory and includes the glory of His saving work, the glory of His kingly rule, and it is here plainly intimated that the only way to that glory lay through the sufferings. The sufferings not only preceded, but procured, the glory.

To the same effect is the other word also reported by Luke, "Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." He thus declares it to be a necessary part of His work—necessary alike by covenant arrangement, by prophetic

anticipation, and by the requirements of the case—that He should suffer; it was equally necessary that He should rise again. Having accomplished the work, He must obtain the reward. Having sown the seed, He must reap the harvest. Having built the temple, He must bear the glory. And so He rises that He may enter upon the fruit of His conquests; and, based upon the work accomplished in His sufferings and death, is the great proclamation of repentance and remission of sins. Because He has died and risen, and so secured redemption, His witnesses can go forth to claim for Him the homage of redeemed men.

His cross a sure foundation laid
For glory and renown.

HUMANIZING OUR PHILOSOPHY

By EDGAR YOUNG MULLINS, D.D., LL.D., President, Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary

A MOST astonishing thing has just taken place in the realm of books. One of the best, if not the best seller for the year 1926 was *The Story of Philosophy*, by Will Durant. A hundred thousand copies of a five-dollar book dealing with the most dry-as-dust of all themes were sold in one year. In fact the edition from which my own copy came included the one hundred and twenty-seventh thousand, and the book was copyrighted in 1926.

This proves one thing clearly, and that is that this modern age has been misunderstood, certainly on one side of its life. We say it is a superficial age. This may be, but it is also an age of deep thinking. We say it is a flippant period, but it is evidently serious as well. We say it is concerned only with the present; evidently it is also deeply concerned with the past and with the future. We say it is an age absorbed in the practical; certainly we shall have to revise this and affirm that it is also concerned with the theoretical.

The truth is that everybody has a philosophy, which is simply one's view of how the world is made and what it means. A child even has some theory, inarticulate indeed, but after all some latent view of the world around him.

Over his head the maple buds,
Over the tree the moon,
Over the moon the starry studs
Dropped from the angels' shoon.

The late Professor William James said that there are two kinds of options, momentous and trivial. You may choose to drink your coffee without sugar; I may insist on sugar in mine. This is a trivial option. You may believe in the Great Horn Spoon; I may be a stubborn unbeliever. This is also a trivial option. You may choose and believe either way, and it matters little, or you may choose to exercise no choice at all, leaving the matter wholly on one side. But you cannot so act in considering whether or not you will be a patriot. You are bound to choose. So also some kind of world view is inevitable, and the option is momentous. A man's view of the universe necessarily affects his view of life and conduct. The most interesting thing about any man is his philosophy, and the more vehemently he disclaims any and all philosophy the more interesting he becomes, because in his disclaimer there is an implicit philosophy.

The story of philosophy is the story of the effort of the world's best thinkers to think clearly and comprehensively about the universe as a whole. Start with the facts as given and seek a unifying principle. Modern science has called thinkers away from abstractions back to facts. The cornerstone of any sound philosophy is not something imagined, or abstractly conceived, but something given, a datum of observation or of experience.

The aim of philosophy is to find a pass key, which will unlock all closed doors and show us the secret Power behind all things. Or, one may say, it is the effort to find a cord long enough to tie up in one bundle all the facts and forms of reality. The philosopher chooses a fact or principle, something actually known, and makes of it a standard of judgment, or measurement for all things. Professor Höfding calls this the "type-

phenomenon" of a given philosophy—a phenomenon or fact taken as a yardstick for measuring all things. For example Democritus, among the ancient Greeks, built his philosophy around the atom. The atom is the measure and ultimate essence of all things. Resolve man and nature, body and spirit, into their ultimate constituents and you have only atoms. Evidently a type-phenomenon may be selected from any level of the known world, from the atom up to man. The truth is, that nearly, if not all, the known facts have been selected as the basis of philosophy.

Spinoza started with substance as the ultimate reality. This possesses two attributes, extension and thought. All things are reducible to these elements. Des Cartes began with consciousness: "I think therefore I am" (*Cogito, ergo sum*). Bergson more recently has taken life, or vital force, as the ultimate key to all being and all progress. Schopenhauer chose the will as known in man as the supreme fact which supplies the key to all experience. Hegel and his successors took reason as we know it in ourselves, but apart from its context of will and emotions, and exalted it into a universal principle. Finally a more recent school of thought, not treated in *The Story of Philosophy*, takes creative personality as the cornerstone of philosophy and explains all things by this fact.

There is another group of theories built on some known principle, rather than upon a concrete fact. The monist is convinced by the one-ness of things as he sees them. The pluralist is equally impressed by the many-ness about him. Thus arise the various monisms and pluralisms in philosophy. Another is chiefly interested in the fact that knowledge arises through action, and thus arise voluntarism and pragmatism. Some are pro-

foundly impressed with the limitations of the human mind in its effort to understand the universe, and agnosticism is exalted into a philosophy.

There is also a group of world-views which may be called the emotional or temperamental group. These are shaped largely by the emotional or spiritual attitude of the thinker towards the universe. The chief problem of life is that of pain and suffering and evil. The scheme of thought is designed to explain a world in which injustice, wrong, disease, and suffering on a great scale are present. Here there are many types of philosophy. We may begin with the pluralist who sees evidence of more than one contending force striving for the mastery of the world, all of which are finite and limited in power. Mr. Wells believes in an unknown or veiled Being entirely hidden from our view behind the universe as we know it. But along with this is belief in a finite god of whom there is clear evidence. This finite god is a struggler like ourselves against the evil and suffering of the world. He needs our help and we should come to the rescue in the great cosmic drama in which there is a great hazard in the ultimate outcome.

Here also should be named the pessimistic systems. The ancient Stoics reacted to a world burdened with pain and sorrow with a philosophy of despair. Man is not a hero in a victorious strife; he is a victim. If Fate decree a life on earth of unbearable suffering, there always remains the one remedy, suicide. Schopenhauer, the modern, with his doctrine of the will, or insatiable desire, coupled with inevitable disillusionment and failure, is the counterpart of the ancient Stoicism. Both systems represent a sort of cat and mouse conception of the universe. Man is the helpless mouse; the world about him is the hungry cat. The mouse is quite aware

of the presence of the cat. He dodges in and out of his hiding places and picks a precarious living amid the scattered crumbs on the floor. But he knows that sooner or later he will be the victim. Mr. Burroughs has written in favor of "accepting the universe," in a view which leaves out the pessimistic note, but which leaves all the factors which enter into the equation of despair.

There is, however, one type of world-view which attacks the problem of evil and suffering more directly and offers a radical solution. It holds that evil is the negative aspect of things which will be gradually swallowed up in the unfolding of the Infinite Life. Evil is the discord which in the end contributes to the harmony in the great system of reality. It is a necessary, but a transient, phase of the growing universe. It supplies the contrast which helps in the end to create joy and peace. It is a form of the finite which is gradually swallowed up in the infinite. Absolute idealism affirms that all is well, regardless of appearances. After all, however, the system is a ruthless one in that the great all is an abyss in which all finite forms of being and experience are finally swallowed up. All the comfort a suffering soul can get out of its fate is, that it is a single minor note in a vast harmony. The vibration ceases; the note is swallowed up in the unity of a greater movement.

One of the most interesting things about world-views is their personal background. They are rarely, if ever, pure intellectual constructions. The age, the historical environment, the personal experience of the thinker, have much to do with his theory of the universe. A man selects his philosophy as he selects a suit of clothes. Whether it is very plain or moderate or loud

in tone or ultra-modern and smart will depend upon the individual taste. But the subjective element will be present in any event.

Voltaire has been reprobated as one of arch-unbelievers of history, and yet he built a church with this dedication: "Deo erexit Voltaire." He praised Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount. He accepted belief in God: "You yourself say," so he writes, "that belief in God has kept some men from crime; this alone suffices me. When this belief prevents even ten assassinations, ten calumnies, I hold that all the world should embrace it. Religion, you say, has produced countless misfortunes; say rather the superstition which reigns on our unhappy globe. This is the cruelist enemy of the pure worship due to the Supreme Being." Here we have the key to Voltaire. It is the prevailing state church, with its persecuting disposition and power, which awoke his wrath. It was a moral even more than an intellectual revolt which explains his anti-ecclesiastical crusade.

The personal equation appears in *The Story of Philosophy* even in the author's selection of material. Idealism gets scant recognition in the volume. Hegel is discussed in a note at the end of the chapter on Kant, and the various successors of Hegel are scarcely mentioned. Schopenhauer is quoted as follows: "But the height of audacity in serving up pure nonsense, in stringing together senseless and extravagant mazes of words, such as had previously been known only in mad-houses, was finally reached in Hegel, and became the instrument of the most barefaced general mystification that has ever taken place, with a result which will appear fabulous to posterity, and will remain as a monument to German stupidity." And yet the idealistic philosophy

is regarded by many as the simplest and clearest of all the systems! Hegel settled in Jena, where he became later a teacher at the university, because it fulfilled his ideal of a place of residence where there would be "simple food, abundant books and ein gutes Bier." Hegel wrote to a friend from whom he sought a loan, "I have made my guiding star the Biblical saying, the truth of which I have learned by experience, Seek ye first food and clothing and the Kingdom of heaven shall be added unto you."

Hegel's philosophy became the official philosophy of the German government, and remained in force down to the world war. That government was the latest expression of the divine will and purpose. The Kaiser's ideal of "me and God" was rooted in the Hegelian conception of history. All movement is through thesis, antithesis, synthesis. That is to say through affirmation, contradiction, reaffirmation. Then the same process is repeated in an infinite spiral movement from lower to higher forms of the expression of the absolute. Pre-war Germany was regarded as the current historical expression of the absolute. The Jewish teacher Hillel was once asked to teach the whole law while standing on one foot. He replied by saying: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." A Frenchman asked Hegel to put his philosophy in one sentence. He replied in ten volumes and said, "Only one man understands me, and even he does not."

Schopenhauer's doctrine of pessimism based on a theory of the will is one of the very best examples of philosophy expressing a mood. There were two sources of the influence which produced the mood, one historical the other personal. Napoleon's career was ended; he had been the very incarnation of the will to power.

Death awaited him at St. Helena. Will incarnated in this superman was defeated; its aims and ambitions had proved futile. Reactionary influences were reasserting themselves. Here then was an environment exactly suited to the rise of a philosophy of despair.

On the personal side there were equally potent influences. Schopenhauer never married. He and his mother were alienated early in his career. He never had a close friend. As Durant says, quoting Nietzsche in part: "He had no mother, no wife, no child, no family, no country. He was absolutely alone, with not a single friend; and between one and none there lies an infinity." In other words, man is a social being. He never really finds himself until he comes into intimate relations with other human beings.

Schopenhauer said, "Noise is a torture to all intellectual people." He also asserted, that "the amount of noise which anyone can hear undisturbed stands in inverse proportion to his mental capacity." He developed a morbid and suspicious disposition. He never trusted his neck to a barber's razor, and slept with loaded pistols at his bedside. He ate his dinners at a hotel where Englishmen were patrons. At the beginning of each meal he would lay a gold coin by his plate and at the end would put it back in his purse. He explained that it was "his silent wager to drop the coin into a poor box on the first day that the English officers dining there should talk of anything else than horses, women and dogs." Details like these not only make Durant's *Story of Philosophy* fascinating reading, they also shed much light upon the types of world view excogitated by the various thinkers.

Schopenhauer declared that will is the true key to being. It is the essence of man; it is the essence of all

life and of inanimate matter. Force is a form of will. Causality in all its forms is to be truly interpreted as will. Gravitation, magnetism, attraction, repulsion, crystallization, indeed all forms of force in crystal, plant, and animal are forms of will. Intellect is subordinate to desire, and will is the instrument of desire. The will to live, the will to reproduce, are aspects of desire which finds expression in manifold other ways. But man always wants more than he gets. Misery and disillusionment await the most heroic effort of the will. Realized desire is as bad as desire because it brings *ennui* and boredom. To become satisfied is to begin to eat up one's happiness, and to pursue desire is a constant pain because of insatiable hunger. Life is evil because life is war. Struggle, pain, conflict—these are of the very warp of our being. The only hope of mankind is that we shall become wise enough to overcome desire and stop the stream of life by ceasing to produce after our kind. This is the only happy ending for a race burdened with the will to live and to reproduce itself.

The close kinship between Schopenhauer's system and Buddhism is very evident to even the casual reader. Buddha's supreme quest was to get rid of desire. Self-annihilation was for him the goal and the method of true life. And this was based upon the fundamental fact that desire is the source of all pain.

In the light of what has been said, how human and appealing is the story of philosophy. It has been by no means merely a cold-blooded quest of intellectuals for a rational principle of explanation. It has been often a passionate human quest for a view of the universe which will satisfy the soul's instincts as well as the reason. In his battle with himself and circumstances man has craved deeply and abidingly some sort of com-

fort and assurance. His kaleidoscopic intellect has sought out many new combinations of the elements of being. His feelings and his moods have entered into his intellectual constructions in ways of which he himself has often been unconscious.

The student of the history of philosophy, especially if he includes in his survey parts of the story not treated in Mr. Durant's interesting book, receives several impressions bearing suggestively upon the processes of thought involved in the various systems. One is, that the strength of each of the philosophies lies in its assumptions rather than in its intellectual constructions. Grant the truth of the major premise of any one of the systems, and that particular view will easily put to rout all the others. Materialism, vitalism, voluntarism, pluralism, in fact any one of the systems can easily be shown to be impregnable—provided you grant its major assumption. If the type-phenomenon selected is permissible then the world view which is built around it may certainly claim a respected place in the intellectual kingdom.

Another truth which appears as a result of an unbiased survey is the ease with which philosophic systems destroy each other. Take as an example the circle of thought which culminated in Kant. Locke held that our fundamental ideas, such as right and wrong, are not innate, present in the mind from birth, but are derived from sensation. The mind is originally a *tabula rasa*. Sense experience is the source of all that we ever know. This alarmed the theologians, who feared that religion might be destroyed by materialism.

But Berkeley came back at Locke with the startling view, that matter for us does not exist at all except as a form of mind. A sensation from without never

reaches us until it is transformed into a mental image in our brain. A "thing," therefore, even if it be your dinner, is nothing but a mental construction, a bundle of sensations unified by your intellect. So that the only reality we know is our own minds and souls. Thus arose the Berkeleian idealistic system.

Then came a hard headed Scotch skeptic, David Hume, who denied that we know anything about a soul or mind. The mind is simply our name for the succession of sensations which we experience. "I never can catch my mind or soul however closely I observe," said Hume. "My sensations, perceptions, memories, and so forth, are my mind." In this way Berkeley completely destroyed matter, and in turn Hume destroyed mind. All turned upon the major assumption with which the thinker began.

Then came Rousseau who decried intellectualism in the interest of feeling and instinct. A thinking man, said he, is a depraved animal. Education may make a man clever, but it does not make him good. Rousseau's attitude was a revolt against mere thought in the interest of life, the human as against intellectualism.

Immanuel Kant declared that Hume awoke him from his "dogmatic slumbers." He worked out a system which has profoundly influenced all subsequent thinking. He showed clearly that the mind is an active factor in all thought. The categories of thought are inescapable. Mind unifies what we learn from without. All knowledge is made over in the image of our minds. The ideas of cause, unity, identity, even the idea of right and wrong, and many other forms of thinking, are inherent in the make of our minds. Just as a landscape is framed by a circular aperture through which you view it, or as water takes the shape of the vessel with which

you dip it from the lake, so mind necessarily gives form to knowledge. Thus Kant transcended his predecessors and in a true sense rounded out what had been thought by Locke and Berkeley, and Hume and Rousseau. But he gave rise to as many controversies as he settled, because of the many-sidedness of his thinking and its dynamic power in stimulating other thinkers.

It is easy to understand why so many despair of finding truth by the road of philosophy, and why a cynic remarked that philosophy "is the search of a blind man in a dark room for a black cat that is not there." The systems devour each other. They remind one of the story, told evidently by a nature faker, of the two Florida snakes which in a fight began to swallow each other by the tail. Each snake slowly disappeared down the throat of the other in a diminishing circle until both vanished from view.

And yet man will philosophize crudely or systematically, simply because man is so made that he cannot avoid it. Agnosticism, or the refusal to think, is one of the most metaphysical of all systems because it implies a theory of the nature of reality of the most radical kind. If we know that ultimate reality is unknowable, we must needs have almost infinite knowledge.

Can we forecast the future course of philosophy? Has the story as we know it any guiding principle which may serve as a clue to future thinking? I venture to think there is such a clue. But it is to be found in a vein of thought scarcely recognized in Mr. Durant's "Story." Lotze and his successors, including the late Professor Bowne and others, have formulated a philosophy of personality which offers itself as the true goal of thought because most adequately interpretative of the meaning of the universe. Personality as we know it in

ourselves is a fact, and therefore a type-phenomenon quite worthy of adoption by any thinker. It seems far preferable to any fact on a lower level, such as the atom of Democritus, the substance of Spinoza, the triumphant but immoral will to power of Nietzsche, the baffled and despairing will of Schopenhauer, the vital force of Bergson. It is evidently a higher conception than the reason of idealism, because reason as a fact for us is always in a context of personality, whereas most forms of idealism employ reason as an abstract principle, apart from will, conscience, and emotions.

It would appear that if thought is ever to be stabilized it will have to do justice to the highest fact known to us, human personality. This is the only center or foundation which can sustain the superstructure. This is another way of saying that philosophy irresistibly tends to become human. The human elements are irrepressible. The partially human systems all have a sort of temporary fascination; but there are slighted elements which will not be ignored.

To make vitalism the center of a philosophy is more appealing than mechanism, because mechanism ignores the obvious fact of life. To make will the center is more appealing than vitalism, because it represents another and higher fact of our own experience. So also reason as a cornerstone of thought seems inevitable in one form or another, because to ignore it seems to stultify all our thinking.

It should not be forgotten that the human instincts and emotions must always be reckoned with before systems of thought can be stabilized. The desire for a world-view which makes room for aspiration and hope is unconquerable in the long run. Tough-minded systems which ignore these deeper instincts will almost cer-

tainly be superseded. The "instrumentalism" of Professor Dewey, which rigidly interprets all man's mental and psychic life as a means of adaptation to environment, without explicit recognition of the future life, is an example. So also systems of self-annihilation, like Buddhism and its modern analogue, Schopenhauer's pessimistic doctrine of the will, break down under the incorrigible optimism of man's spirit. Man's disgust at life and his moral revolt against the world is itself strong evidence against the truth of pessimism. Man being a part of the totality of things, his pessimism is the universe repudiating itself. And this implies that there must be a deeper truth behind the revolt. Suffering and evil, of course, are stubborn facts. But if we look at these in the light of the view that life is a school for training men for freedom, there is some relief. And if we consider that the production of character is more important than ease and comfort, we may come to see that we can be enabled to accept suffering and transcend it, as well as "grin and bear it" like the Stoic.

Our moral instincts inevitably reject Nietzsche's will to power, culminating in his superman. To say that sympathy and love and patience and forbearance and humility are a "slave morality," to be repudiated, is to do violence to our deepest moral nature. And to affirm that death ends all for man, upon evidence supplied by scientific delving into matter and motion, is to clash with an irrepressible individual and racial instinct.

The charge of anthropomorphism (that is, that we are remaking the universe in our own image) no longer terrifies the philosophic personalist. You can find no scientific basis for thought except below man in nature, or in man himself. And certainly it is reasonable to suppose that the Infinite Being behind the things we

see is at least equal to the highest product of the world He has made.

I do not wish to be understood as offering arguments to prove a particular philosophy, but rather as pointing out the irrepressible elements in human thought. I would emphasize the view, that the universe is rational emotionally, volitionally, esthetically, morally, and spiritually, as well as in the ordinary sense of "rational." The weakness of behaviorism is that its psychological apparatus for measuring human reactions to sense impressions is too narrow. Facts of consciousness, such as freedom, power of choice, moral and spiritual aspiration, inevitably overflow the prescribed limits. Behaviorism is like the levee system along the Mississippi, sufficient for the average level of the river, but when the waters rise and the great river attains a higher self-expression the levee breaks and the country is flooded.

The sanest and healthiest and most satisfying of all the world-views seems to be, that behind the things we see there is a Person who cares for man, and who has a purpose for him, and a worthy destiny.

And it may be that science, baffled in its effort to solve the spiritual problem, and philosophy, unable to stabilize itself otherwise, will come each by its own circuit to the experience which Browning attributes to David in one of his poems. David had been trying to charm away the evil spirit from King Saul by playing on his harp, but he had failed. The failure transformed his great love into a poignant grief. David's mind leaped to the conclusion that God must love even more deeply than he could love, and that God's love, unlike his own, must be coupled with a corresponding power, and so he exclaimed prophetically, "See the Christ stand." He saw indeed that the universe must be emo-

tionally as well as intellectually rational. And whatever forms philosophic thought may assume, certainly the imperatives of emotion and instinct, of faith and religion, as well as the imperatives of the bare reason, will enter into man's solution of the meaning of the universe.

The above has been written regarding man's reason in its effort to solve the mystery of the universe. For the Christian believer Jesus Christ and His salvation and the Scriptures as God's record of His revelation, present the whole problem in a new light, and the mysteries of the intellect find solution. Jesus Christ brings to men exactly those needed elements of thought which are lacking in the natural reason. The true philosophy must include them, and when it does, reason will meet faith, and they will clasp hands in an indissoluble friendship.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

THE SPRINGS OF EVANGELISTIC POWER

By REV. S. D. CHOWN, D. D., LL. D.

WALTER HINES PAGE, in his book entitled *The Rebuilding of the Old Commonwealth*, pays a notable tribute to the pioneer preachers of the United States of America. He expresses his judgment of them in the following remarkable terms:

"I doubt if we ever produced other men as great as the pioneer preachers. They were cast in so large a mould, they dealt so directly with the fundamental emotions of men and with some of the great facts of the spiritual life, that they almost ranged themselves with the giants. I had rather have known one of these men than all the political or military heroes we have since bred. The politician has been the greatest popular hero, but the preacher has had much greater influence. For a century he was by far our greatest man—the man of the largest original power, and the strongest character."

This broad but discriminating outline of the character and achievements of the spiritual heroes, who contributed so signally toward laying the foundation stones of the republic in the cement of deep religious conviction, is a noteworthy tribute, by a gentleman of wide outlook and conspicuous public insight, to the incalculable value of their immense national service.

These early preachers were the paramount psychologists and supreme spiritual dynamos of their day, and were not without "understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do." Their preaching fitted closely into the fundamental needs of human nature, and never

has emotion worked out its appropriate fruit more truly and successfully than under their ministry. In their ideals and in the substance of their theology they were worthy archetypes for the ministers who man the pulpits of America today. Our imperative duty is to follow the gleam they shed upon the early history of their country, for if this continent is to fulfill its Providential design it will be by cleaving to the purposes which lured the fathers forward in their adventurous way.

Repentance, regeneration, and renewal, the three Rs of the way of salvation, which inspired the preaching of the fathers, must be the groundwork of the truest success today. To neglect these evangelical truths is "to attempt to make brick without straw."

The church of Christ marks time when a balance of emphasis is not observed between scholarship and evangelism. Discussion which permits the theological and psychological by-products of the Gospel to overtop its saving truths chokes the growth of the church and sacrifices its supreme opportunity. To permit these undergrowths to obscure the great doctrines of grace will score nothing but futility. I fear such a danger now threatens modern religious literature. The purpose of the present article is to open up the fructifying springs of power which gave such fertility to the ministry of our ancestors in the pulpit.

Of course one must not presuppose a common mind even among the successful pioneers of religious effort. The conception of a composite mind controlling any class of thinking men is always more or less of a fiction. In the religious pioneers particularly there was the free play of forceful personality. We can, therefore, hope to distinguish only the characteristic enduements of the more forceful personalities of a dominant class.

The secret of their power which I will mention first is, that they conveyed their message in language easily understood by the mass of the people. Careful training in theology has the preliminary advantage of digging into the depths of truth, but it may be a detriment in reaching the uneducated. A schooling in theological terminology makes it easy for the preacher to express his particular point of view concisely; but that facility of his only makes it harder for the ordinary congregation to understand what he is driving at. The preacher should exercise a vigorous mentality to translate his theological lore into a vocabulary which the people pick up without mental effort. Strained attention counteracts emotional impression. Every effective preacher must know the way of salvation, the truth about it, and must express the truth in terms of the life of his own day. This the early fathers did.

Another secret of their power is found in the fact that their whole life was organized around a single dominating purpose, which was then called "the salvation of souls." The inspiration of that unified ideal produced a type of character and a reserve of influence which gave superhuman impact to their preaching. We are told that the weight of a cannon should be a hundred times greater than that of its shot. A considerable portion of the pioneer preachers were not intellectual heavyweights, but the attraction of their devoted personality drew people to their Gospel with a force a hundred times greater than their words.

Their life was not confused in its purposes, and their major activities disorganized by necessity to attend to a multitude of details which, in these later days, seem to wear an imperative aspect, but in reality have no important relation to the chief end of the ministerial office.

Engineering the machinery of the church tends more and more to demand a greater amount of time and attention than the minister is permitted to give to reaping the real harvest of his divine calling. In many churches, under their present organization, the evangelistic successes of the past are almost inconceivable, and often the feeling of impotence to obtain similar results crushes out of the hearts of men of deep devotion to their ministerial work the ambition and purpose to do so.

Another essential element in the equipment of the fathers was an almost uncanny gift of penetrating the conscience of their hearers, compelling them to acknowledge the reality of sin, and to fear its consequences. They were the "discerners of spirits" of that day. If a man had a sin upon his conscience, they ferreted it out. They dragged it to the light. They held it up as worthy of the execration of Heaven and earth, and sometimes led the shrinking culprit to believe that Satan himself might well be ashamed of his handiwork. Their psychoanalysis was adequate to cope with any spiritual condition.

Then, the men who planted the evangelical churches of America believed also in the "baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire." They sought this baptism diligently. It meant to them divine power and love uniting to impart spiritual enthusiasm. The fire philosophy ran through their whole work. It purified their hearts from sin and filled them with love for all mankind. They were persuaded that human character could no more be renovated apart from the agency of divine fire than cold cast iron could be reshaped regardless of material fire. Having sought and obtained this baptism, they felt themselves qualified for the most important service in life.

The warmth of their love surprised and, at the same time, melted into penitence even hardened offenders against divine law. This glowing fire of love shone upon their faces and gleamed in prayerful solicitude in hymns they commonly sang. The spirit of repentance, the experience of regeneration, and petition for continuous renewal, all breathed through such lines as,

O that in me the sacred fire
Might now begin to glow,
Burn up the dross of base desire,
And make the mountains flow.

O that it now from heaven might fall
And all my sins consume,
Come Holy Ghost, for Thee I call,
Spirit of burning, come.

Refining fire go through my heart,
Illuminate my soul;
Scatter Thy life through every part,
And sanctify the whole.

Such stimulating hymns were fuel for evangelistic zeal. They became paeans of victory and torchlights in the march of a triumphant ministry.

Another factor in the success of the founders of the great churches of America was found in their belief in the presence and power of the Holy Spirit to save souls in the ordinary means of grace. Their sermons were trustfully committed to the Spirit of God as instruments of regenerative blessing. With this in view, they appeared not so much to have "gotten up" their sermons by scholarly study as to have prayed them down in a spirit of mystical devotion.

Their utterances breathed upon the people the oxygen of Heaven, and were to all sorts of hearers a religious tonic. They created an atmosphere of expec-

tation in which almost anything good might happen. These pioneers did not hamper the outflow of their spiritual energy by anxiety for esthetically pleasing impressions. They had no propensity towards artistic inutilities of rhetorical display. Their business forbade oratorical dudishness.

One of the most successful of the pioneer insurance men of this continent, who, until almost the last day of his life, enjoyed nothing more richly than buttonholing "prospects" for life insurance, was approached by a friend in the interest of a man who needed employment. The manager's only question about the applicant was, "Can he close a contract?" The pioneer preachers constantly submitted their work to the test of fruit. The supreme criterion of success was the number of contracts with God, life partnerships with Jesus Christ, they were able to close.

Another essential to the success of the pioneer preachers was their faith in the paramount personal importance and the instrumental value of prayer. They were spiritual rainmakers. They knew how to "wrestle with God" until showers of blessing descended upon the people. They believed in the contagion of a prayerful spirit in their congregations as a condition precedent to success, and they labored to produce it. Their ministry was altogether marked by a spirit of co-operation with the Spirit of God. In accordance with this, they preached the saving truths of the Gospel without hesitation or apology.

In this generation we are apt to think of the doctrines of pure grace as too elementary to be emitted from scholarly minds. The typical sermons of the fathers, however, showed that simplicity is not shallowness, and that it requires more intellectual power to

preach arrestingly the truths that save men than to philosophize upon abstract theology, or preach popular topical sermons upon current events. It is the simple proclamation of profound evangelical truths that brings salvation and begets Christian progress.

The fathers had a clearcut evangelistic theology which fitted into the convolutions of a sinner's heart. They did not cultivate a mere moral estheticism or attempt the portrayal of Jesus in such attractive psychological coloring that admiration might induce love for His personality. They did not teach that children were so much more susceptible to religious influences than older persons as to cast doubt on the possibility of persons being saved who had neglected salvation until later in life. Had such a conviction prevailed in earlier days, Augustine, having wasted himself in lasciviousness, would never have been redeemed to exercise his profound and widespread influence upon the thought of the universal church, Martin Luther would not have originated the Protestant Reformation, and John Wesley would never have realized that the world was his parish, and his commission to save souls. These champions of the faith and numberless others were converted many years after the period of adolescence, in the strength and vigor of their early manhood.

Neither did our fathers believe that personal salvation was a by-product of social evangelism. They believed that the social Gospel, so far as it was then developed, dealt with the appropriate application of the power of personal religion to social progress. They did believe, however, in what is beginning to be called "real evangelism," in contradistinction to the types I have just alluded to. This evangelism of the fathers was built upon the sense of personal salvation from sin.

Every element of their working theology anticipated sin and was focused upon personal experience of the regenerating effect of the Gospel of grace. They believed in conviction of sin, which they conceived to be a revelation to the individual by the Spirit of God of the dire wickedness of his heart and life. They believed in repentance as a Heaven-wrought sorrow for sin deep enough to turn a sinner from his evil ways to the service of the Most High. They believed in the full assurance of faith, or the testimony of the Spirit of God to one's adoption into the family of Heaven. They believed in holiness as the reproduction of the life of Christ in human life, expressed by a heart in which the love of God has been shed abroad by His Spirit.

The theological terms they used in their work of salvation were all linked to some activity of the Spirit of God. In the present day these terms seem like badly worn coins which have lost their original image and superscription, but in the evangelism of the fathers they represented a ladder of blessings stretching from earth to Heaven. As they realized in experience the blessings represented by these definitions they testified to their possession. In fact, the substance of their preaching was either direct or indirect testimony in the Holy Spirit to their own spiritual attainments. This type of preaching, in its natural reaction, produced a testifying people, who advertised religion so well that the churches were filled with attentive congregations who either accepted or consciously resisted the Spirit of God.

In justice to the ministers of today it should be remembered that the fathers had some immediate advantages over their successors. They themselves believed, and their hearers with few exceptions believed, that the Bible was divinely inspired in every part for the express

purpose of conveying direct messages from the throne of God to each person in the congregation. Every commandment, every precept, every example, and every promise came to them with the power of a "Thus saith the Lord" behind it. The original purpose of any passage of Scripture was not permitted to have the effect of weakening its present personal application. Such belief reinforced and gave gravity to every utterance from the pulpit. Today, in most pulpits, the direct application of a passage of Scripture is intercepted by an intervening historical interpretation. The new attitude to the Bible produced by criticism has not yet borne a full spiritual fruitage in the popular mind. Saving truth has not faded out of the Book, but at present its application is sometimes refracted by the prism of modern scholarship.

It is also important to remember that the fathers had the advantage of an emotional appeal, made the more vivid by an imagination which was influenced by a belief in a material Heaven and hell. The people had visions of a Heaven whose streets were paved with gold, its walls jasper, and its gates pearl. They attuned their hearts to the music of angelic choirs led by archangels, the corridors of Heaven resounding with songs of perpetual joy.

But a change has come. The picture they once had has faded from their imagination as a photofilm fades from the canvas. The fact of immortality, however, abides as an unshaken conviction. In many minds the principle of evolution is the capstone of evidence for that fact; but the employments and enjoyments of Heaven are darkened by a veil of misty uncertainty.

In the older days of evangelism hell was represented as "a dark and bottomless pit full of fire and brimstone."

So said the catechism. A rough eloquence sometimes depicted the souls of men as "hair hung and breeze shaken over the pit that has no bottom." In a more remote period the redness of the sun at his setting was said to be due to the reflection of the flames which tortured eternally the spirits of the lost.

Today, careless people make grim jokes about these pictures; and whatever people joke about, whether true or false, does not carry them very far into the realm of conviction. Thoughtful and sincere people, however, now inwardly accept the confession of the poet, "myself am hell." What is the worm that dieth not but a perpetually accusing conscience? What is the fire that is not quenched but a memory haunted and tortured with misdemeanors, the ghosts of which cannot be laid? The laws of conscience remain. To annihilate them might wreck the foundations of the moral universe; and while they remain hell is not far away from a guilty conscience. Evolution may disguise human responsibility by tracing the origin of temptation back to animal ancestry, but the vitality of conscience asserts itself by repudiating that relief and putting the stamp of personal demerit upon human sin.

Nothing that this essay contains about the work of personal salvation should be permitted to detract from the great sum of service the Christian church has rendered to the world by way of moral training, social betterment, economic justice, purity of government, wholesomeness of manners, and in a thousand other directions, all of which have imparted to our civilization a distinctive Christian tone.

What this paper pleads for is the fortification of Christian character by undimmed purity and divine strength, that it may be more competent to reach and

settle the tremendous issues which scar and vex our civilization today.

No one feels that the world in which we live is an ideal one, but those who have given thought to its real need feel that it is ideal for the development of strong Christian character, and that no generation of men who have inhabited this earth has ever carried such responsibilities as the present one or enjoyed such opportunities of coming to the fulness of the stature of Jesus Christ if faithful to our duty.

The present is a serious moment in the history of the great historical churches of this continent. They are on trial. Their leaders are crying out for "a re-birth of evangelism." Christian people are hungering for it. Numerous religious organizations have sprung up recently which, because their message satisfies this hunger (though oblivious to modern Biblical criticism), are attracting to their services multitudes of people who belong to the older churches.

A progressive theology cannot save any church if it does not practice its own essential beliefs. Physical science has made most remarkable progress since the discovery of the law of gravitation. It is now full of the hushful wonders of electricity and the silencing mysteries of radium. But would not a scientist of today who would propose to ignore such an essential law as gravitation be scorched by his own folly? Science is one, whether its constituent truths be of ancient or modern discovery. It needs all the truths it has discovered to build its growing temple.

Theology is also one. Recent discoveries have clarified its vision. Notwithstanding this, it cannot discard the essential truths which have proved their reality by their works in the past. Old methods of work may be

come impracticable, and old religious terms may become timeworn, but the old Pentecostal doctrines must be carried into the future with all the esteem paid to the most modern additions to scientific theology. If this be done, the triumphs of the Christian church, facing as it does a future compact with greater opportunities than ever, shall far exceed the victories it has already achieved.

TORONTO, CANADA.

NERO AND THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS

By E. G. SIHLER

MY COMBINING of these matters into a single theme is not at all subjective or far-fetched. The Christian church in the era of Lactantius and Eusebius of Caesarea counted ten persecutions, of which the one under Diocletian and Galerius was the most severe. Up to 313 A.D. or so the term *Christianos*, at first originating at Antioch on the Orontes (Acts 11:26 *sqq.*), had not been the general name. Galileans or Nazarenes seems to have been widely used to designate the new sect, the students, pupils, adherents, catechumens among whom in that great city Luke¹ (Lucanus), the physician (and painter), was a prominent and devoted convert. "Messiah-believers"—was there anything odious or dangerous in that designation? Now we, in our remoteness of time and culture, when the term Christian in itself rings out as something absolute, lofty, and precious, must not apply this valuation and all its content and honor to the time from 31 to 313 A.D., when for the first time Constantine's Edict of Milan freed and legally emancipated the Christians from the grievous burden associated with the name.

Of the secular nationalistic meaning and hope associated with that Name (Messiah), for *us* the greatest of all names, and non-secular at that, I must speak briefly. Both in the home land and throughout the Diaspora there was yearning for a second David or, still

¹His narrative style is perceptibly tintured by the prototype of the Septuagint, a matter to which we cannot now devote further attention.

better, a new Cyrus or Alexander, to throw off the yoke of Rome, as the Macabees had thrown off the oppression of the Seleucids in their day. That was the current conception, even among His own disciples, such as the sons of Zebedee or Simon Bar Jona not long before his last entry into the Holy City. Even in the infant years of Jesus, "false Messiahs were assuming the diadem and gathering troops of banditti."² The anxiety and later the cruel fury of Herod the usurper (Matt. 2:16), protégé of Rome, is thus readily understood, and, on the other hand the mission sent by the Baptist from his dungeon at Machairus³ in Peraea to our Lord (Matt. 11:2), with the question, "Art thou the one that is to come or shall we expect another one?" Neander thus sums it up: "Thus the deluded Jews, destitute of the faculty for the spiritual apprehension of divine things, expected a Messiah who would employ the miraculous power with which he was divinely armed in the service of their secular desires; who would free them from political bondage, execute severe retribution on the enemies of the Theocratic people, and make them masters of the world in a universal empire" (Neander: *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, tr. by Torrey, vol. I, p. 369), a *rex regum* like the kings of Persians, and now, Parthians.⁴

The "Kingdom of God," which the Son of man (Dan. 7:13-14) consistently proclaimed and also illumined by His own divine model of goodness, was limited by the Jews in a nationalistic sense of their own, a world empire that was to absorb into itself⁵ all secular power everywhere. Hence to make the inference at once, ob-

² William Smith: *New Testament History*, Amer. Ed., p. 101.

³ Josephus: *Antiqq.* 18, 5, 2.

⁴ Cf. also Luthardt on the Gospel of John, vol. I, p. 369.

⁵ Cf. Philo: *De Execrationibus* II, 436, Mangey. Cf. Luke 24:21.

vious to the Roman government, I dare say, something odious was or could be readily conveyed into it by those who hated Him and His followers. The enemies of Jesus in the current theocracy turned this Messiah-charge directly against Him before the Procurator of Tiberius (Luke 23:2) when they cunningly coupled the termination of Roman taxes with the Messiah Name. Or compare John 19:12, "Everyone who makes himself 'king' [accepts the name 'Messiah'] argues against [*antilegei*] the authority of the Emperor."

This then, I am deeply convinced, we must hold firmly before going forward. Clearly the term "Messiah-believers," or "Messiah-adherents," was *ab limine* an odious one, bestowed by hatred and contempt, a name injurious and dangerous, and meant to be so. And indeed, already, some years before the great fire at Rome, in 64 A.D., and before the consequent or incident persecution of the Christians there, the very name had become odious and dangerous.

Further, the second coming or appearance (*parousia*) of the Messiah was an essential part of the earliest Gospel preaching, from the Euphrates to Spain, as it had been from the lips of Jesus Himself in His last weeks and days—the woes uttered against the city itself and the Herodian temple, the parables of His last discourses with their trenchant and terrible force. All these things must have been embodied in the earliest spread of the Gospel; no single matter could make the chasm between the new Gospel⁶ and the old current Jewish theocracy more impressive or arrest more the attention of the new converts out of the "nations" (*ἐθνῶν*). We think of the unrest of the newly founded church at Thessalonica

⁶ Cf. Matt. 9:17, "the new wine in the old bottles [skins]"—it is impossible.

seeking clearness and hope from St. Paul. Even in the preaching of the Baptist occurred "the wrath to come," directed at many of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. 3:7); "on that day" in the mouth of the Lord Himself (Matt. 7:22); "in the day of judgment" (Matt. 10:15). Also we observe how frequently He faced or confronted for His coming church both the Jews and the "nations," *i.e.*, the entire non-Jewish world. Tyre and Sidon will fare better on the Day of Judgment than His hearers (Matt. 23:24; *cf.* 12:41); the harvesting of tares and wheat (Matt. 13:30); the consummation of time (the world) (Matt. 13:40, 49; 16:27; 19:28; 22:30; 24:3, 27).

We pass to the great Apostle: "Until he shall come" (1 Cor. 11:26); "we must all be uncovered before the tribunal [*βῆμα*]⁷ of the Messiah" (2 Cor. 5:10); "why judgest thou thy brother . . .? for we shall all of us be placed before the tribunal [*bema*] of God" (Rom. 14:10); "and grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto [better, "against"] the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30); "until the day of the Christ [Messiah] Jesus" (Phil. 1:6); "that you may be sincere and without offense till the day of Christ" (Phil. 1:10); "for our conversation"⁸ [*politeuma*, our pilgrimage, our franchise] (Phil. 3:20; *cf.* Heb. 13:14). I do not here attempt to solve who was meant by "the man of iniquity," whose revelation must come first (2 Thess. 2:3). Nor do I assume to solve the utterance of prediction by the Lord Himself (Matt. 24:15; *cf.* Dan. 12:11). Caligula might fit it fairly well, as he might

⁷ *Cf.* the *bema* of the Proconsul of Achaia, Gallio, brother of Seneca (Acts 18:12, 16).

⁸ A case where the translators of 1611 followed the *conversatio* of Jerome's version of *πολιτευμα*. It is really nearer to the *civitas* of classical Latin (Phil. 3:20).

still more fit into the further exposition in Paul (2 Thess. 2:4 *sqq.*). Or is it an allusion to the Roman institution of emperor worship? Both letters to the Thessalonians were written in the last years of Claudius (Zahn). In Paul's second and last imprisonment at Rome "that day" was one of his great and fundamental consolations (2 Tim. 1:12).

First Peter most probably was written some years before the fearful catastrophe of 64 A.D. What was the persecution for the name "Christian" to which he refers (1 Pet. 4:12 *sqq.*)? Jesus Himself had foretold it (Matt. 24:9)—"and you will be hated by all the nations [the entire non-Jewish world] on account of my name." With due deference to other students, I will briefly set down my own conclusions, arrived at after much pondering and sifting of the evidence: The Jews, with whom the Messiah-believers, or Christians, were of course confounded, or apt to be confounded, by the *ethnikoi*, had the strongest possible motives to differentiate themselves from the Christians. And, I believe, they had an equally strong impulse of civil and business prudence to stir provincial Roman officials against the new sect. There may have been "witnesses" to the Name, like Stephen, whose names have not reached us. We may here cite from the recent book on Peter, by Dr. F. J. Foakes-Jackson⁹; he interprets 1 Peter 4:12 *sqq.* thus: "A persecution, furious and very wide-spread, had broken throughout Asia Minor. . . . It was a systematic persecution, not of the mob, not of the society, Jewish or Gentile, in which the Christians lived [information and denunciation by both classes, I take it, of Roman subjects, would naturally lead to official action],

⁹ Peter: Prince of Apostles: A Study in the History and Tradition of Christianity. New York: Doran, 1927, p. 114.

but of the government. When they suffered it was to the death. Now this Persecution is described as a 'fiery trial' (1 Pet. 4:12) which has come as a surprise." "None of you shall suffer as a murderer or thief or evil-doer or as one who meddles in the affairs of another: *but if as a Christian*, let him not be ashamed," etc.

Now we must be cautious lest we trip up by bringing in the *argumentum de silentio*; the nonmentioning of Jews, with due deference to Dr. Foakes-Jackson, proves nothing. At this particular point I would beg my readers to follow me upon a passage in Galatians, written probably in the spring of 52, according to Dr. Zahn. I append my own version and exegesis: "All those who desire to put on a fair outward show¹⁰ in their worldly relations [in the flesh]: these coerce you to be circumcised, merely *in order that* they may not be persecuted on account of the cross of Christ" (6:12), by which Jew-propaganda they would prove absolutely that they were non-Christians. For circumcision, the current and everywhere final proof of Judaism, would *ipso facto* exempt such men from persecution. It seems fair to assume here the same persecution, or a similar one, as that to which Peter refers.

From this preliminary survey we will now go forward to the great fire at Rome, in 64 A.D., and the Neronian persecution ensuing. A brief outline of the unspeakable monster himself must precede.¹¹ Brought to the throne in October, 54 B.C., as a lad of not quite seventeen, through the unscrupulous intrigues of his mother, Agrippina, accession accelerated by the crime

¹⁰ Εἰς προσωπήσιν. How often we have the very pulse of St. Paul, who coined words as he needed them, with consummate force; besides the first meaning of προσωπον is a mask.

¹¹ An admirable treatise on the sources is A Critical Study of the Sources of the Emperor Nero, by J. N. H. Jahn, a doctoral dissertation of New York University, 1920.

of the poisoned mushroom¹² and with prompt securing of the Praetorian Guard, excluding Britannicus the late Emperor's natural and legitimate son. At first Nero ruled fairly; that is, Seneca and Burrus determined the administration at home and abroad. We may even fairly assume that Seneca published his own *De Clementia* early in 56 B.C., when Nero had recently completed eighteen years, as a quasi-program of his pupil and the inaugural of the Golden Age,¹³ the realization of the loftiest ideals of statesmanship, humanity, and morals. Of course, delicate flattery is woven through the text, flattery of which Seneca was master, not less than of satire. He places the imperial youth on the stage before an admiring world—"Have I of all mortals been pleasing and chosen to discharge the functions of the gods in the world? Should I be the judge of life and death for the nations?" (*De Clementia* I, 1, 2.) "The laws, long imprisoned [under his predecessor Claudius] shall guide my course." It is vain to pursue the abject flattery of the philosopher and courtier-politician any further. The very sculptured images of the face of Agrippina's son that have endured tell the story—at accession the kindly face of a lad of distinguished lineage; but within twelve years or less a grim and scowling face, aged before its time by monstrous and unmentionable dissipations. His (adopted) brother Britannicus, his Empress, the spotless Octavia, the very mother who had borne him and made him Emperor and who had been some check on his more wayward or vicious passions and appetites, he destroyed after a fictitious reconciliation. Charioteer, virtuoso on the lyre,

¹² See Seneca's bitter travesty, *Ludus de Morte Claudii*, in which that courtier-philosopher revenged himself for his Corsican exile.

¹³ Cf. Suetonius: *Nero*, ch. 10 sqq.

a veritable opera singer—we pass it over. Most of the texts of his monodies, if not all, were Greek, and his first appearance in his Orpheus aspiration was staged in Neapolis, then still essentially a Greek town. When he made his tour in Greece, especially taking in Olympia, the government of the Capitol was left in the hands, not of the Conscript Fathers, but of a Greek freedman, Helios. We may well sum up this brief outline by a comprehensive judgment of Suetonius. “Waywardness, sexual dissipation, luxury, covetousness, cruelty, he practiced little by little at first, and secretly, and as it were, as a matter of youthful petulance, but in such a way that even then it was doubtful to no one, that these were faults of his inborn character, not of his time of life.”¹⁴

The capital, Italy, the provinces, from the Caspian Gates to Gibraltar, and from the Cataracts of the Nile to the Clyde, must have come to know much of this; there was no single theme in all the Mediterranean world concerning them all nearly as much, and never before had the interpassage of men, news, and wares been so free, so constant and easy, as when Babylon on the Tiber overtopped them all.

Coming now to the fire of 64 A.D. and the persecution, I cannot here even allude to the veritable forest of controversy and speculative dissent that has sprung up around these great themes, especially from Gibbon onward to yesterday. The Voltairian just named¹⁵ on principle belittles the Christians of that time in every way. His reasoning even is here particularly loose. He suggests that Tacitus¹⁶ actually confounded the Christians at Rome with the Jewish sect of the Zealots, who,

¹⁴ See Suetonius 20; 23; 26.

¹⁵ Ch. xv.

¹⁶ Annals xv, 44.

in the time of Claudius, had followed Judas the Gaulonite. Gibbon misses completely the protecting power of Nero's Empress Poppaea,¹⁷ whose intercession for certain Jewish petitions and complaints against the Procurator Festus Josephus records, "for she was a worshiper (θεοσεβής)," a proselyte(?).¹⁸ Josephus was a close contemporary of Nero, born like him in 37 A.D., when the Jews had some eight synagogues in Rome. Gessius Florus, after Albinus,¹⁹ gained the procuratorship of Judaea through the favor enjoyed by his own wife Cleopatra at the hands of Poppaea. Her interest, it would seem, in *rebus Judaicis* was clearly a constant one. During the procuratorship of Felix, 63-64, a short time before the great fire young Josephus had personally gone to Rome and successfully interceded with Poppaea²⁰ for certain Jewish dignitaries detained in Rome. Now the Jews at Rome, like those of Alexandria, Ephesus, Cyrene, Corinth, etc., were manufacturers, bankers, and merchants, shrewd and successful men, whose collective power and influence in the Roman Wall Street even Cicero in his day held in awe.²¹

In quite recent times we have had works like that of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's, referred to before. To this we will now add *Die Christenkatastrophe unter Nero und ihre Quellen, insbesondere nach Tac. Ann. XV, 44 von neuem untersucht*, by Dr. Theo. Klette, Tuebingen, 1907, a monograph of some 150 pages. Klette, who devoted enormous pains to the whole problem, writes,

¹⁷ Cf. the characteristic sketch by Tacitus (XIII, 45 sqq.) of the year 58 A.D., when young Nero was in his twenty-first year. Her "husbands" had been Rufius Crispinus and Otho whom she had promoted to Lusitania to net her chief quarry at the capital, where she remained for that successful end.

¹⁸ *Antiqq.* xx, 5, 4.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.* xx, 11, 1.

²⁰ *Vita* 3.

²¹ *Pro Flacco*, 59 B.C.

page 117: "For the general disrepute of the Christians, fanned by the Jews, which we find to be emphasized by Tacitus, and through whom [*i.e.*, the Jews] the Christians may have been recommended to Nero as victims, always had as comprehensive expression the name '*Christianus*'" (p. 117). Of course, as we all must, Klette refers to Pliny's experience in Bithynia.²² Poehlmann in Hauck-Herzog²³ holds the same view. Klette also cites 1 Peter 4:15, as I did independently, above, and as does Dr. Foakes-Jackson. Some nineteen years ago the eminent archeological and topographical expert on Ancient Rome, Professor Chr. Huelsen, contributed a brief but meaty paper, *The Burning of Rome under Nero*, to the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1909, No. 1), where we learn that an Italian of Milan (in 1900), Professor Pascal, actually put the blame entirely upon the Christians. Nero mainly wished to extend his Golden House and rebuild some of the worst quarters of the capital. But, Huelsen urges, it was full moon on July 17, exactly one day before the first fire broke out, the least convenient circumstance for a gigantic plot of arson. Long ago, when much occupied, academically, with Tacitus, I became convinced that accidents began the fire, in shops around the Circus Maximus, high winds blowing, Nero being away at Antium. What happened in the course of the ever widening conflagration, and whether new designs were suggested by the ever widening sheet of flames, is another matter. As for Nero's concern for "religion" of any kind, Roman, Jewish or the new sect, we may rest content with Suetonius: *Religionum usque quaque*

²² *Epp.* x, 96.

²³ Third ed., vol. XIII, p, 720.

contemptor, praeter unius Deae Syriae. Hanc mox ita spreui ut urina contaminaret.

To the scholars named I now have great pleasure in adding Professor Elmer T. Merrill's *Essays in Early Christian History*,²⁴ a work touching on the matter in hand at many points. On the slenderness of extant evidence about Peter in Rome we find Merrill and Foakes-Jackson in full agreement. Dr. Merrill takes "Babylon" (1 Pet. 5:13) as Babylon on the Euphrates. I cannot accept his exegesis of *fatebantur* in Tacitus xv, 44, as "they pleaded guilty" (p. 83); my exegesis, like that of Dr. Klette, is: "They confessed" (that they were Christians). I fully agree with Dr. Merrill, on the other hand, that "cultured Romans knew little of Christians and cared less" (p. 91), but I utterly disagree, when he says that almost all worship was "open as the day." *Non credo*. Think merely of the etymology of *profanus*.

The great fire, we said, began on July 18, 64 A.D., the day after the full moon. Some of the most shameless pleasures of Nero had been of recent occurrence, with the details of which I must not stain this essay, merely adding that in such detail Tacitus maintains a certain hauteur compared with the micrology of the antiquarian Suetonius. The shops around the Circus Maximus were, some of them, full of inflammable stuffs. Nero came to town from Antium only when the flames began to approach his Golden House, in the *vestibulum* of which stood his own colossal statue, 120 feet in height.²⁵ Of the fourteen *regiones* or wards of Rome four escaped entirely, three were utterly wiped out, in the seven others but a few ruins remained. Some of the

²⁴ London: Macmillan, 1924.

²⁵ Suet. 31.

most venerable sanctuaries of Roman religion were destroyed, such as the little hexagonal Vesta temple, with the *Penates* of the Roman people, the *Regia* of Numa, the temple of Jupiter Stator once vowed by Romulus, the very *incunabula* of Roman history and roots of her greatness. The Sybylline Books were duly consulted and certain acts of propitiation enacted. Still the general public persisted in claiming a fire of design. I will now, as do most of my fellow-students in this field, give Tacitus (*Annals* xv, 44) in a version of my own:

And these things were devised for the future by human counsels; soon atonements were sought from the gods, and the Sibylline Books were [officially] resorted to, by whose response a supplication was offered to Vulcan [the god of fire] and to Ceres and Proserpina, and Juno's grace was sought through the matrons, first on the Capitol, then on the seacoast [*Ostia*], and with water drawn from it the temple and the image [*simulacrum*] of the goddess were sprinkled, and dining couches were spread and all-night rites celebrated by women who had husbands. But not through human resource, not by the Emperor's bounties or by appeasings of the gods would go down the evil report, that the belief was held that the conflagration was ordered; therefore to do away with peoples' talk [*abolendo rumori*] Nero brought forward as culprits and visited with the most exquisite penalties the persons whom, hated as they were on account of their shameless deeds [*flagitia*], the wider public was wont to dub Christians. The originator of that name, Christus [Messiah] during the reign of Tiberius [14-37 A.D.] had been executed through the Procurator Pontius Pilate, and the wretched superstition, checked for the moment, broke out once more, not only in Judaea, the source land of that vicious thing, but also in the capital [*per urbem*] whither all outrageous or light-shunning [*pudenda*] rites converge and are observed.²⁶ Therefore first those were seized who confessed [said that they were Christians]; then by

²⁶ St. Paul's Epistle to the "Christians" at Rome—"to the chosen saints of God who are at Rome"—sent from Corinth in Feb., 58 (Zahn), was written a little more than six years before the persecution. In the long list of members greeted in Rom. 16 there are very few directly Jewish names. But we well know that in the long practice of the older Diaspora the assumption of Greek and Latin names was a common custom among Jews.

their information [*indicio eorum*]²⁷ a vast number were found guilty, *not so much within the charge of arson* as on account of their hatred for mankind [*odio generis humani*], and, as they were dying, entertainments [for the Roman public] were added [to the spectacle of their execution], so that they perished, covered with the skins of wild beasts, by the mangling of dogs, or nailed to crosses, or, condemned to being burned alive, when the day was done were burned so as to serve as torches for the night. Nero had presented his own park for the show and was giving a chariot race entertainment, mingling in the crowd in the garb of a charioteer, or standing in a chariot. From this arose pity, howbeit directed against guilty wretches [*sontes*] and men who had deserved the most exquisite forms of penalty, as though they were done to death, not from any consideration of public welfare, but to gratify the cruelty of a single individual.

So far Tacitus himself. Before going forward we must not pass over the name of the man who then was closest to, and most influential with Nero, Sofonius Tigellinus, who with the Empress Poppaea constituted the "innermost council"²⁸ or cabinet of Nero, especially a little later on in kindling or counseling his cruelties in the Pisonian conspiracy (65 A.D.). The Jews, we may confidently infer, under the aegis of their mighty protectress, were immune in that catastrophe. Now, Tigellinus was an object of wide suspicion because the fire had broken out, it was claimed, in a tract of real estate belonging to Nero's favorite.²⁹ We may here cite from Juvenal,

Pone Tigellinum, taeda lucebis in illa,
qua stantes ardent, qui fixo pectore fumant
et latum media sulcum deducit harena.

(*Saturae* I, 155 sqq.)

²⁷ Possibly some were slaves in Nero's household, or freedmen there (cf. Phil. 4:22), and this letter was written in Rome, in the summer of 63 (Zahn), only one year before the persecution.

²⁸ Tacitus: *Annals* xv, 61: Poppaea et Tigellino coram, quod erat saevienti principi intimum consiliorum.

²⁹ Tacitus xv, 40.

"Name Tigellinus; then you will be lighted up in that torch, with which are burning those who are smoking [while] nailed through the chest, and the middle of the sand forms a wide trench," *i.e.*, in which they drove the stakes to which the victims were nailed.³⁰

There is a further matter, overlooked I believe by scholars, viz., the *Acta Diurna*, literally the "Daily News" (what transpired at the capital) carried continually to every part of the Roman Empire, the Tiber city in a way being the heart of the whole *corpus*. Aquila, born in Pontus, manufactured tent cloth in Corinth, in Rome, in Ephesus, and ultimately again in Rome. Clement of Rome (*Ad Corinthios* 5) not only refers to the martyrdom of St. Peter, intimating that the latter's troubles in Rome were due to the jealousy of false brethren, and that he finally suffered death there and "passed to his due place of glory," but he also in the same chapter links up with it Paul's martyrdom while distinctly alluding to his having been in Spain, (after his acquittal). Clearly Paul was not in Rome at the time of the great fire. Zahn has Paul return from the East to which he had gone from the West, from Spain, probably avoiding Rome on that last visit to his charges in Asia Minor; but he too, if we may trust Clement, was a victim of betrayal. In chapter 5 the *Episcopus* of Rome intimates further that in the persecution husbands turned against their own wives. One is apt to be reminded of the Lord's prediction cited above: "And you will be hated by all the nations for my name's sake." Pliny the Younger, born in 61 A.D. at Comum, was then three years old, his famous and intimate friend of riper years, Tacitus, being about eight years old at the time of the fire.

³⁰ *Cf.* the commentary of J. B. Mayor.

We must here, however concisely, turn to Pliny's governorship of Bithynia and his inquiry of Trajan, how to deal with the "Christians" there.³¹ "I asked them themselves [*ipsos, i.e.*, did not accept rumor or hearsay] *whether they were Christians* [Messiah-believers]. When they confessed,³² I asked them a second and a third time, threatening them with capital punishment. When they persisted, I ordered them to be led away to execution." (*Epp.* x, 96.) Pliny before this had never been present at, or officially concerned with, trials of "Christians." A government procedure of mercy was this: "Those who denied that they were Christians or had been, when they, on my uttering the formulas for them [*me praeunte*], accosted the gods, and your bust, which on this account I had ordered to be brought in, together with figures of the divinities, with incense and wine, and furthermore cursed Christ, none of which things it is alleged those can be forced to do who really are Christians." (Examine the entire letter.) At once we are reminded of 1 Corinthians 12:2 *sqq.*—"Anathema Jesus!"

The change from idolatry to Christ was, may I say, abrupt, absolute, radical. There was no transitory procedure. Mere tradition (*παράδοσις*) makes no Christians. Then, too, the new life, turning their backs to the old, cutting asunder bonds of social habits everywhere, and so, directly or by implication, challenging and defying and condemning much of the life around them, the new code of conduct, was the very thing which called for overseers. The term *episkopos*—no matter what new layers of content and connotation the hierarchy of later

³¹ I have great satisfaction in directing my readers to the excellent edition by Dr. E. T. Merrill, Macmillan, London, 1901, which I used for many years with my classes.

³² *Patebantur*, cf. Tacitus xv, 44.

development ultimately put into the name and function—at the beginning meant overseer, and not much else. In the sudden and abrupt aloofness and manifold withdrawal, demanded by conversion, teaching, and baptism, the responsibility of the *episcopus* to those within as well “those without” (1 Cor. 5:12; Col. 4:5; 1 Thess. 4:12) was supreme. Clearly too, when the *ecclesia* was a single household, the housefather was also the *episcopus*. The little primitive church at Philippi had several *episcopi* (Phil. 1:1), unless we assume that congregation was *ab initio* larger than other germinating points of the great Apostle’s labor.

In that primitive age, too, the members as truly one family were wont to greet one another with the “holy kiss”³³ (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:26; 1 Pet. 5:14). The spotless conduct of the Messiah-believers was to be their chief argument and means of self-defense both against Jews and the “nations” (Titus 2:7). (And a consistent Christian life is still the more efficient “apology” of Christianity, with due deference to the long series of apologists from Tertullian to Pascal and further.) Paul uses the term “to walk” and to demean oneself as a citizen (Col. 3:7). On the family compare Colossians 3:18; as to no loafing or laziness, 1 Thessalonians 4:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:6; on slaves, 1 Thessalonians 5:12; on the qualifications of an overseer, 1 Timothy 3:6; on widows, 1 Timothy 5:5. Was there a form of admission involving a statement of belief? See 1 Timothy 6:12 (essential conformity to the *katechesis* of the Gospel of Christ, I take it). As

³³ Out of which custom and the *agápe* or love-meal, together with baptism and Eucharist were perhaps bred the foul charges set forth in the *Octavius* of Minueius Felix. From Augustus to Augustine, Cambr. Univ. Press, 1923, p. 51: “They call themselves promiscuously ‘Brothers’ and ‘Sisters,’ so that even in a customary way debauchery is done under guise of a holy name.”

to a man who chooses his own personal conception of belief, see Titus 3:10. For the beacon set by the Lord Himself, see Matthew 5:14, "You are the light of the world." The *ethnikoi* (pagans) are referred to in Matthew 5:47; 6:7; "the nations," in 6:22; 10:5. "Few are chosen," we are told in Matthew 22:14; *cf.* 24:31. Strangers and temporary sojourners are mentioned in Ephesians 3:19. "The latter day world" (written by Paul at Rome, not long before he laid his head on the block on the Ostian way) occurs in 2 Timothy 3:1 *sqq.*, with which compare the grave and gloomy survey of Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* xxii, 22.

As to the sacred Scriptures of the primitive church, as far as written copies for current and common services were concerned, it is a familiar fact not to be lost sight of here, that it took considerable time until the slowly aggregating canon of the New Testament became the base of homilies and Christian worship. Take the so-called Barnabas letter. "Among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers it holds the same place as the Epistle to the Hebrews in the New Testament" (Westcott: Canon, etc., 7th ed., p. 43; *cf.* also W. Milligan in Dictionary of Christian Biography *s. v.*). The Old Testament, largely of course in its prophetic and pedagogic use and function, predominates in an impressive way. In a recent study of Barnabas (ed. of Lightfoot) I counted citations as follows: Isaiah, 37; Jeremiah, 11; Psalms, 27; Exodus, 21; Deuteronomy, 12; Genesis, 13; Leviticus, 15; Daniel, 2; Zechariah, 3; Proverbs, 1. On the New Testament side, Matthew, 8; Acts, Hebrews, Romans, Revelation, John, each one only. Many of the Old Testament references are clearly off-hand, from memory, with easy accommodation to the

matter in hand, not rigidly verbatim, when collated with the Septuagint.

As to eschatology we note the following: The final offense (*skandalon*) has approached, we seem to hear again the note resounding in Paul (2 Thess. 2:3); clearly the sharp segregation from the world surging about seems quite as actual to that generation as to that of Paul or Peter. We must be firm now (ch. 4); the present epoch is called the "time of lawlessness." Barnabas warns against those who withdraw from congregational worship and edification, as though already "having accomplished their own righteousness." There is also abundant and luminous asseveration of the Messiah's pre-existence and universal lordship, essentially identical with John (ch. 5). Christ suffered for us, though Lord of the entire world, to whom God said at the beginning of the world, as to His Son, "Let us make man" (Gen. 1:26). His ultimate power of judgment is stated thus: "Because, having himself accomplished his own resurrection, he will judge." So, too, His suffering was by His free will (Isa. 50:6 *sqq.*). They will see Him on that day (ch. 7; *cf.* Rev. 1:7). We, Barnabas argues, have now clear vision; the Jews, with their mechanical adherence to ceremonial, have not (ch. 8). The Sunday, the Christians' day, is also called the "eighth day." "Hence also we shall keep the eighth day for rejoicing, on which also Jesus arose from the dead, and having been revealed went up into heaven" (ch. 15). The new heaven and the new earth, the consummation of all things, strongly remind us of Revelation, when the Jewish calendar will be abolished.

Clearly the temple of Jerusalem is gone (ch. 16), "The pitiable Jews set their hopes on that edifice." The *Bellum Judaicum* seems to be an event of not very re-

mote past. His readers seem to be former *ethnikoi*, not Jews. "What, or where, then is the temple of God? Is there one? Before we acquired faith in God the residence of our heart was perishable and weak, as being really a temple built by hand, because it was full of idolatry and of *daimonia*, weak because we did everything that was adverse to God." It is a spiritual temple. Be gentle to your slave and to your handmaid, for they hope in the same God (ch. 19; cf. St. Paul to Philemon).

We must not pass by here the Shepherd, by Hermas.³⁴ Here then we have a Christian treatise of clear warning and instruction, written in Greek, at Rome, for Roman Christians. The Latin terms *cervica* (pillow) and *subsellium* (seat, simple chair) are met with in Greek spelling. The road to Campania is in the scenery, as are the mountains of Arcadia. Perhaps we have here a Greek freedman in Rome. A great number of concrete things in the actual environment there are met with at every point. There are weak Christians who resort to manticism as the "nations" do (Mandate 11). We hear also of traveling "prophets," who claimed inspiration and who delivered themselves in the Christian congregations. The allusions to the Epistle of James³⁵ are fairly numerous. Do not practice the luxury of the "nations" (*Similitudo* 1). The "nations" will be destroyed by fire, because they did not recognize their Creator (*Sim.* 5). Fasting (*stationem habere*) is deprecated. "The acre is the world"—clearly after Matthew 13:38. It is on account of the worldly Christians (*Sim.* 6, 2) that the name of God is blas-

³⁴ Monograph by George Salmon in Dict. of Christ. Biogr. He lays great stress on Zahn's edition (1868) which places the date about 97 A.D.

³⁵ Even verbal, as *χαλιναγωγείν*, Mandate 12; cf. James 2:26; 3:2.

phemed. We turn to persecutions: "What, I say, did they endure?" "Listen," he says, "stripes, prison cells, great tribulations, crosses, wild beasts, *on account of the Name*" (Visions 3, 2, 1). He returns to this central theme in Visions 8. He calls Jesus "the law of God," proclaimed to the ends of the earth (Visions 8, 3). Now there is a class, the real martyrs, "who did suffer on behalf of the law [Christ. He means the actual martyrs]: there is also another class, who did endure tribulation [*θλιβέντες*] on behalf of the law [Christ], without suffering martyrdom, and without denying their law [Christ]."

Another type or class (Visions 8, 6) consists of those who became "apostates and betrayers of the church, and who blasphemed³⁶ the Lord in their sins." There is also a class which avoids association with the saints (8, 8)—a class, on account of its affairs (business or politics?) which blasphemed the Lord and denied Him. Again there is a class which believed (once) and (then) wrought the works of "lawlessness"³⁷ (lapsed in their conduct), "but they never withdrew from God [formally left the church] and gladly bore the Name, and gladly received into their homes the servants of God." The points made about the "two-minded" (*δύψυχοι*) are like a red thread interwoven everywhere—the doubters, the insincere, those liable in any tribulation to lapse back to the "nations." Further, the ever present contingency of governmental investigation or persecution is the very atmosphere of the times when this rare document was composed. There are also those who may

³⁶ Cf. Pliny: *Epp.* x, 96, referred to above, *praeterea maledixerunt Christo*. . . .

³⁷ As Christ is called the Law, by this author, he seems to intimate that such Christians, in morals, had done something *unchristian*, here and there.

return (*i.e.*, to be taken back into the church), those “who did not blaspheme their Lord nor become betrayers of the servants of God” (9, 19).

There is a further matter which, however briefly, we must touch upon as belonging to our general theme. It is the *Septimontium*, Rome, the Great Babylon drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses, the martyrs of Jesus (Rev. 17:6). And, no matter to what school of interpretation one may be inclined, in dealing with the Apocalypse, there cannot well be two different conceptions as to 17:18, “And the woman which you saw, is the great city which holds sway over the kings of the earth. . . .” It is Rome on the Tiber, which the Romans themselves in subsequent generations were wont to call *urbs aeterna*. And while chapter 18 of the Apocalypse is grammatically and symbolically a prediction, was it not evoked by the reminiscences of the terrible catastrophe of July, 64? And the extreme luxury of her life, and the exquisite wares feeding that luxury, wares imported from every source, from Gibraltar to India—where else would there be the central mart for them all save in the great city through which were enriched all who had vessels on the sea, from her luxury (costliness)? In a single hour she was made desolate; rejoice over her, O heaven, and the saints and the apostles and the prophets, “because God did exact your judgment from her.” It would not be a very bold leap, or rather it would be a fair suggestion, that, by “apostles,” Peter and Paul are really meant, as directly expressed above by Clement of Rome, in chapter 5.

We must not now omit asking, What was the body of the preaching (τὸ κήρυγμα) in the primitive and original churches? Think of the great Apostle. Paul at An-

tiochia (Pisidia, Acts 13) attached the mighty Gospel facts to the antecedent history of Israel and the saving Messiah, crucified by Pilate, but risen afterwards, coupled with the prophetic introduction of His person (Ps. 2:7), son of David, in the mighty spiritual and universal, not secular or nationalistic sense. On the Areopagus, on the other hand, while urging Him as the final Sovereign and Judge of the universe, he appealed to other things and utilized his actual environment with consummate wisdom. But, quite apart from these apologetic and introductory addresses to strange or hostile audiences, what was the teaching to the neophytes? The story of Jesus. And this recent digest of mighty facts, transpiring within the narrow limits of a few years in Palestine, must have been literally taught. Let us turn to the introductory words of Luke in Acts 1:1, "the things which Jesus began to do and to teach." Both were *in nuce* the self-revelation of the Messiah, essentially what we now summarize in the second article of the Apostles' Creed, so-called, substantially and comprehensively the "mystery," as Paul was fond of designating it in his very last years, a mystery indeed, but not like the worship of Isis or Mithras, or Magna Mater.

Not merely John Mark, secretary perhaps of traveling Peter, or Matthew and his Gospel for Hebrew readers,³⁸ or Luke either who gave Paul's Gospel—but (Luke 1:1) "since *many* have undertaken to arrange in order about the things which have been brought to *full consummation* [as fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy—*πεπληροφορημένων*] among us" [*i.e.*, we have been witnesses, and we, the Messiah-believers, appropriate these deeds and teaching as meaning everything to us who

³⁸ Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 24, 6 sqq.

have assumed His name] as those transmitted them to us [παρέδοσαν] who from the beginning [the baptism of John] became *eyewitnesses* [αὐτόπται—selfseers] and servants of the story [or account], I too [determined] having pursued [“traced”] everything with accuracy from the beginning in order to write it for you, most worthy Theophilus, in order that you might grasp the reliable character of the discourses, about which you were orally-taught [κατηχήθης]”³⁹ a freer version of Luke’s introduction and dedication.

The “apostles”—many more than the original eleven—clearly taught the neophytes the essential parts of the Gospel story; the mass, the total, was too great.⁴⁰ The teachers and apostles had to subdivide, select, emphasize. They might begin their appeal and good message with the Resurrection, or swell the outstanding features of the judgment to come. But to conclude, as we now do, the first messengers and teachers, those who “taught orally,” must have been fortified by a *written syllabus* of the Gospel facts, and it seems a bit stale to harp on Mark and any *Proteuangelion*, or Protomark.

³⁹ Cf. Stephanus s. v., “viva voce doceo, qui rem quampiam insonat auribus eorum quos docere vult.” Cites Acts 18:25; Luke 1:1.

⁴⁰ Cf. John 21:25.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

CURRENT LITERATURE IS RICH IN STRIKING EXPRESSIONS, examples of which follow. Care has been taken in each case not to weaken or distort the meaning in giving a selection without its context, but rather to bring out an author's thought more vividly by setting it alone.

"Each child of the human race is invited to become a child of God."—*F. B. Meyer.*

"Biography used to be the art of exposition; now it is become the art of exposure."—*Charles A. Bennett in Harper's Magazine.*

"Knowledge is of the greatest value in preventing wrong decisions, but it does not of itself lead to decision and action."—*Viscount Grey of Fallodon.*

"The way American business is conducted affects the average American more profoundly than the way the American government is conducted."—*Glenn Frank.*

"As to obsessions—I suppose they are never removed by any reply we make, as they are rarely modified by any appeal to facts or to common sense."—*Dr. Edwin M. Poteat.*

"Our ministers ought to give themselves to the study of God's Word and to prayer. We shall never have great preachers until this is the case."—*The Watchman-Examiner.*

"And class consciousness is the fertile soil where professional agitators sow the bitter seeds of class hatred. Class hatred is the herald of revolution."—*Edmund A. Walsh in The Atlantic Monthly.*

"I believe that before any great revival will come to our churches we, who are in the church, will have to seek purification from our own sins."—*The Evangelical Church by Dr. Frederick E. Taylor.*

"Chivalry taught a man to die for a lady's glove; Puritanism taught a man to die for justice and righteousness, and human rights, and the sovereignty of Jesus Christ."—*Dr. James D. Rankin in The United Presbyterian.*

"If Christian missions fail, the rest of us had better close up shop. The missionary program represents the most successful enterprise for the reclamation of mankind that the modern world has ever seen."—*David Lloyd-George.*

"The great doctrines of Christianity come not from Calvin or Augustine, but from the Holy Bible. It is not the theology of the middle ages over which the battle rages, it is the theology of the New Testament."—*The Watchman-Examiner.*

"People like social and benevolent work, but when there is no social advantage, no personal gain; when there is something hard that has to be done without personal advantage, enthusiasm falls away and volunteers are few."—*Dr. John M. Thomas of Rutgers College.*

"This gospel cut its way through centuries of entrenched heathen superstitions and heathen morals. It can do it again, if only it is proclaimed by those who know it to be true, because they have lived it themselves."—*Dr. H. H. McQuilkin in address before the Synod of New Jersey.*

"What our colleges should rather seek is those men who add to an indispensable competence in their profession, moral earnestness, sincerity of life, and a contagious devotion to the things of the spirit."—*President Arthur Stanley Pease of Amherst College in his inaugural address.*

"During the past nineteen hundred years, once and again the Jesus of history has been buried. He has been buried in churches, buried in creeds, buried in a so-called Christian civilization. But it was not possible that he should be holden."—*Ernest Fremont Tittle in The Christian Century.*

"The painters must paint the dead Christ of a different hue from the living Christ; the preachers, if they are spiritual artists, must show us how to turn our thought from the deadly wounds to the triumphant scars of the Resurrection Body."—*Dr. J. Rendel Harris in his book, As Pants the Hart.*

"But there are many men who know the facts, know how to present the facts, but do not know how, by means of those facts to kindle enthusiasm, to evoke great ideals, to inspire

with passion for service, those who sit under them.”—*Dr. Ozora S. Davis in The Chicago Theological Seminary Register.*

“It may be questioned whether rough honesty is ever absolutely honest, or whether a blunt statement can be absolutely true. In roughness and bluntness there may be a good deal of laziness and selfishness; there will certainly be little imagination.”—*Professor John Erskine in The Century Magazine.*

“Complaints are sometimes heard that in the Chinese revolution Christian churches and the Christian religion have been subject to attack. If the Chinese revolution had not taken account of Christianity, that fact, rather than what has actually taken place, would have been a proof of failure.”—*A. L. Warnshuis.*

“It cannot be maintained that Protestantism has had any great success in teaching people to pray. Too frequently its sanctuaries are really lecture halls in which the minister delivers two discourses; the one a sermon, called the pastoral prayer; and the other an address, called a sermon.”—*Reinhold Niebuhr.*

“Many think that the fundamental problem of our time is religious. I myself believe it, and I believe that it has always been thus. I do not believe that it is a question of inventing a new religion for our times, but rather of reinforcing and deepening existing religion.”—*Benedetto Croce, Italian philosopher.*

“We may have a genuine interest in missions, like to read articles in this and other publications, and like to hear missionaries and officials speak—this alone, however, will not generate that dynamic power for which the homelands and the foreign lands are now looking.”—*Richard K. Morton in The Congregationalist.*

“I believe that you will meet open minds and hungry minds, because I believe that the doubt of today is not a stubborn doubt, but a confused and unsatisfied and yearning doubt. You will meet hungry minds, but you will not meet submissive minds.”—*Dr. J. J. Murray in Commencement address, Union Seminary (Richmond).*

“Too often prosperity shuts people up in proud isolation. But when they begin to suffer they begin to understand. There are people who never thought of heaven till some one died. Let a person experience a keen loss, and a vision of something

better and deeper dawns upon his soul."—*Dr. George L. Robinson in The Master Bible.*

"Men, in their long journey toward death, picture to themselves a variety of pleasant halts—a few steps more, the day's journey will be ended, and then will come the hour of repose, around the fire. But in time's continuous flow there is neither repose nor halt. Every evening the past is a dream, the future a mystery."—*Andre Maurois in The Forum.*

"The envy my large income excites entertains me. It is one of the few sources of amusement a great fortune leaves its owner. The most disillusioned men I know are those millionaires who dreamed there was a connection between ability to buy and desire to have, and on waking found that the power to satisfy appetite destroyed it."—*John Cosgrove.*

"If there is to-day a loss in political interest, I suspect that it comes partly because the people feel, and with much justice, that political battles are too often sham battles, and that there is in them too much hypocrisy and pussy-footing away from realities, too much self-seeking and often downright imbecility."—*Governor Albert C. Ritchie of Maryland.*

"The American farmer of to-morrow will be either a peasant or a cooperator. If we judge the future by the strength of present trends, and without faith, we have little basis for anything except a forecast of peasantry. If we mix with present facts a faith in God and the latent powers of man, we may still have hope for something better."—*Fred Eastman in The Christian Century.*

"If God is the Unknown and the Unknowable, if the Bible is half fact and half fable, if Jesus is the foremost of religious teachers, but severely influenced by the beliefs of his day, if indeed there is no authority except those mercurial emotions of one's inner being—then indeed a church is a questionable investment, financially as well as religiously, and it is hardly logical to labor for a cause that is uncertain, if not unreal."—*The Presbyterian.*

"There is no surer sign of God to those who have eyes to see, no surer sign that this world means, for each of us, something personal and holy, than just this, that to every one of us, and that in all sorts of ways, days are continually presenting themselves when we may face some cross for the glory of the Highest, or may turn our back upon some cross in order to

defend our own ignoble ease.”—*Dr. John A. Hutton in The British Weekly.*

“Science has taken away the ineffable sense of living in a universe of providential arrangements, where personal intimacies and spiritual communions are the natural outcome of religious faith, and given in exchange a highly organized universe of material forces, which surround man’s soul with an iron-bound necessity through which it cannot break, to commune with that which it still dimly feels is its life.”—*Dr. Harris E. Kirk at fiftieth anniversary of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance.*

“Dean Swift once said that for Peter, James or John as individuals, he had the kindest feeling, but that for humanity in the mass, he had nothing but contempt. The temptation of our day is to reverse the order and to participate in organized charity while we show but little charity toward individuals. Our benevolence is of the general, theoretical, universal kind which expresses itself in noble thoughts about the brotherhood of man and troubles itself little to be brotherly toward men.”—*The Presbyterian Advance.*

IN THE SCRIPTURES THERE ARE CERTAIN TREMENDOUS PHRASES which, even taken apart from any particular context in which they occur, repay devout and extended meditation. It is to be feared that, uttered so often “trippingly on the tongue,” they have lost to our minds something of their sublimity. Yet proper reflection upon their true depth and meaning may restore it.

One such expression is “the glory of God.” A striking thought, especially when the mind dwells upon the fact that it is dealing here with that Being whose infinity radiates in every direction—along love, goodness, knowledge, wisdom, power, duration, space. What must His glory be that springs from such sources, both universal and without limit?

Then, if in addition to one’s general contemplation, he turns to those sublime passages where the expression is found, its impressiveness is greatly enhanced. In *The Christian* (London) Rev. G. H. Lunn has in these sentences recounted some of the Biblical settings of this mighty phrase, “the glory

of God," and some of our reasons for the hope that we may behold His glory:

"Here we reach the summit of all our aspirations and the satisfaction of all our dreams. Beyond this, there can be no other desire, for, in the manifested glory of God, all life's holiest ambitions are realized. Here faith is lost in sight, hope passes into realization, and love receives its crown. The triumph of faith will be complete when the prayers of all the saints are answered, and the glory of the Lord is revealed, so that all flesh shall see it together. All things were made for this end; this is the 'one far-off' divine event to which the whole creation moves.' The visions of Isaiah, the Messianic prophet, anticipate that glad Day when the glory of the Lord shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea.

"The Entrance-hall of Faith leads us ultimately and triumphantly into the Throne-room of the Presence of His Glory, and the Glory of His Presence. The theme of the opening strains of the heavenly chorus which flooded the hills of Judea with the music of eternity on the first Christmas Eve was the glory of God. Stephen saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. The New Jerusalem which is to be will need no sun neither moon to shine in it: for the glory of God will lighten it, and the Lamb will be the Light thereof. How inextricably and eternally is the Lamb slain linked with the glory of God, and how impossible it is to read God's revelation in the written Word without beholding the glory of the Incarnate Word. The marvellous work of grace which wrought in us the miracle of regeneration, by which Jesus saved our souls from the nethermost hell, will be perfected when the same Captain of our Salvation brings all His sons unto glory.

"Jesus promised Martha that she should see the glory of God if only she would believe, and that promise was fulfilled when her brother Lazarus came forth from the darkness of death, in response to the summons of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life. And in Martha's experience we have the history of our own. Faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God will lead us ultimately to the place where we shall see the glory of God. But for the purpose of our present meditation we shall do well to remind ourselves that the glory of which the Apostle speaks here is to be enjoyed by the believer as a present possession *with a future prospect*. 'We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.' To quote from Bishop Moule's valuable exposition of the passage: 'We exult, not with the sinful

“boasting” of the legalist, but in hope (literally “on hope,” as reposing on the promised prospect) of the glory of our God, the Light of the heavenly vision and fruition of our Justifier, and the splendour of an eternal service of Him in that fruition.”

JUST WHAT IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE GREAT CENTRAL PRINCIPLE underlying foreign missions? Again, what new ideas have made such a question necessary? In an address on the eve of the Student Volunteer convention at Detroit Dr. Robert E. Speer gave these answers which every missionary propagandist should seriously reflect upon:

“There are ideas abroad today which cut at the very roots of this missionary obligation. It is said that we have no right to carry on a cultural invasion of other nations, that each nation has a right to its own religion, that Christianity has as much to learn as it has to teach, that we are unwarranted in disturbing and destroying the religious inheritance of Asia and Africa, that the new national churches are able and willing to dispense with us, that it is time for us to give these churches their liberty, that we are not wanted by the people, that we are upheaving and embroiling the whole world with the ferments released by Christianity, and that, as to China, it has pulled down its own house and should be left to learn its lesson among the wreckage. All this is said and a great deal more besides.

“But, first of all, who is our Master and where do we get our orders? One is our Master, even Christ, and we have His clear command, ‘Go out and make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.’ It was His intention to release forces which would upheave and overthrow the world, destroy injustice and inequality, polygamy and slavery, child marriage, infanticide and the oppression of widows wherever these things, or anything else that is evil, should be found. And wherever they are found Christianity turns a pitiless light upon them and works to remove them with pitying sympathy and love. Its mission is not a cultural mission nor the offer of an alien religion. It is the fulfillment of a trust, the offer to all the world of the only universal gospel, the only religion which is the true religion for every man and all the world, the one and only Saviour and Lord, the Son of God. We do not go out to compare His

religion with the religions of the world and we do not carry a Western message. We carry the Bible, which is a universal book, every word of which was written by Asiatics, and we proclaim Christ and His salvation and ask all men to join with us and to let us join with them in learning ever more and more of the truth which is all in Christ, in whom, and in whom alone, dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Every nation has indeed a right to its own religion, and every nation's own religion is Christianity. It is our duty to offer to every man his and our only Saviour. The whole world needs Him and, more and more, men throughout the world are turning toward Him."

THE SPIRIT OF THEOLOGICAL DISCONTENT, WHATEVER ITS NAME at any particular time, has become marked in modern religious thinking, and has begun to bear its natural fruit. In the earlier days of foreign missions those who were devoted to this form of service, whether missionaries or their supporters, had one great central aim—to carry the Gospel of Christ to every soul on earth. But now the church, more or less divided over the interpretation of that Gospel, is inclining to movements for the social betterment of the mass rather than the spiritual regeneration of the individual.

It is entirely normal that human life in this world should be vastly benefited by the influence of the Gospel, yet that does not mean that the social uplifter should precede the preacher. It certainly does not mean that he should supersede the preacher. Yet the tendency has lately been in that direction, though it is easy to overestimate the extent of the results thus far.

In connection with the failure of American Protestantism, with an increasing membership, to provide adequate funds for its missionary wing, it has been pointed out that the theological conservatives are the chief givers, and that, when they fear that their money is not used mainly for the spread of the evangelical faith, their gifts diminish.

The change of front in missions was revealed in the recent convention, in Detroit, of the Student Volunteer Movement for

Foreign Missions. The old motto, "The evangelization of the world in this generation," was no longer in evidence, but reports indicate that, instead of this great slogan, the air was filled with doubts and questions. The Christian Advocate thus summarizes this new and unfavorable spirit:

"It is noted by some who watched the Detroit meeting that the ready and confident response to the call to the mission field came chiefly from students whose theological views were most nearly in line with those of the past. The old-fashioned theology, with its clear-cut teachings regarding sin and salvation through faith in a divine Christ, still, it seems, supplies an adequate motive to lead generous youth to dedicate his life to the fulfillment of our Lord's commission. On the other hand those who have modified and nebulous views of the personality of God, the divinity of Christ, and the efficacy of the remedy for sin which was revealed in His life and death, are prepared to criticize others but not to surrender themselves. A church which lowers the name which is above every name and admits other 'saviours' to equality or near-equality with Him, has no appeal to the idealism of generous youth. 'Liberal Christianity,' whether under the Unitarian name or any other, has failed to arouse that spirit of heroic self-sacrifice which is basic in missionary success. Mere 'uplift' is not adequate motive. If the Church has not a divine Christ to offer to the world as a Saviour from its sins it cannot expect success in its appeal for service. It is easy to secure volunteers when the war is on. Men will enlist and face all manner of perils when the issue is joined for a life and death struggle. But when there is no enemy to be faced, there are no queues around the recruiting stations. If Buddha and Confucius are Christs enough for India and China, why be a missionary to preach Bethlehem and Calvary?

"Dr. John R. Mott, Dr. Robert E. Speer and others, whose voices used to sway these students gatherings, seem to have had less influence there than formerly though still admitted to a place on the program. They have not lowered their claim for the supremacy of Christ."

JUST AS WE ARE ALL PHILOSOPHERS, SO WE ARE ALL CRITICS. However, the two words cover a vast range of values. Whatever may be said of our philosophies, most of our criticism is

superficial or negative, or both. Moreover the personal element stains it throughout.

Few people who use the word criticism have any very accurate idea of its true signification, except its secondary meaning, of pointing out faults. True criticism seeks to appraise things according to their true values, to measure them by correct standards. But this is just what few of us do, or perhaps can do. Most of our criticism is to a considerable extent the expression of personal bias, even of personality. A true critic, one accurate in facts, fair in spirit, penetrating in analysis, and sound in interpretation, is very rare, even making the usual allowances for human limitations.

Professor Irving Babbitt of Harvard has been called "perhaps our most powerful intellect, as he is certainly the most virile personality, in the whole realm of criticism and scholarship," and one who reads after him is inclined to endorse this characterization. In *The Forum* he has considered the subject of criticism itself, in a paper called *The Critic and American Life*. After paying his respects to the school of criticism represented by H. L. Mencken, he takes up the latter's strictures upon the Puritan, and then continues:

"It has been affirmed that the point of view of the Puritan was Stoical rather than truly Christian, and the affirmation is not wholly false. The present discussion of the relationship between Puritanism and the rise of capitalism with its glorification of the acquisitive life also has its justification. It is likewise a fact that the Puritan was from the outset unduly concerned with reforming others as well as himself, and this trait relates him to the humanitarian meddler or 'wowser' of the present day, who is Mr. Mencken's pet aversion.

"Yet it remains true that awe and reverence and humility are Christian virtues and that there was some survival of these virtues in the Puritan. For a representative Puritan like Jonathan Edwards they were inseparable from the illumination of grace, from what he terms 'a divine and supernatural light.' In the passage from the love and fear of God of an Edwards to the love and service of man professed by the humanitarian, something has plainly dropped out, something that is very near the centre. What has tended to disappear is the inner

life with the special type of control it imposes. With the decline of this inner control there has been an increasing resort to outer control. Instead of the genuine Puritan we then have the humanitarian legalist who passes innumerable laws for the control of people who refuse to control themselves. The activity of our uplifters is scarcely suggestive of any 'divine and supernatural light.' Here is a discrimination of the first importance that has been obscured by the muddy thinking of our half-baked intelligentsia. One is thus kept from perceiving the real problem, which is to retain the inner life, even though one refuse to accept the theological nightmare with which the Puritan associated it. More is involved in the failure to solve this problem than the Puritan tradition. It is the failure of our contemporary life in general. Yet, unless some solution is reached by a full and free exercise of the critical spirit, one remains a mere modernist and not a thoroughgoing and complete modern; for the modern spirit and the critical spirit are in their essence one.

"What happens, when one sets out to deal with questions of this order without sufficient depth of reflection and critical maturity may be seen in Mr. Sinclair Lewis's last novel. He has been lured from art into the writing of a wild diatribe which, considered even as such, is largely beside the mark. If the Protestant Church is at present threatened with bankruptcy, it is not because it has produced an occasional Elmer Gantry. The true reproach it has incurred is that, in its drift toward modernism, it has lost its grip not merely on certain dogmas but, simultaneously, on the facts of human nature. It has failed above all to carry over in some modern and critical form the truth of a dogma that unfortunately receives much support from these facts—the dogma of original sin."

"As a matter of fact, according to the degree and nature of the exercise of the principle of control, one may distinguish two main types of realism which may be denominated respectively religious and humanistic: as the principle of control falls into abeyance, a third type tends to emerge, which may be termed naturalistic realism. That the decline of the traditional controls has been followed by a lapse to the naturalistic level is indubitable. The characteristic evils of the present age arise from unrestraint and violation of the law of measure and not, as our modernists would have us believe, from the tyranny of taboos and traditional inhibitions. The facts cry to heaven. The delicate adjustment that is required between the craving

for emancipation and the need of control has been pointed out once for all by Goethe, speaking not as a Puritan but as a clear-eyed man of the world. Everything, he says, that liberates the spirit without a corresponding growth in self-mastery is pernicious. This one sentence would seem to cover the case of our 'flaming youth' rather completely."

PROVINCIALISM IS IN A GENERAL WAY ASSOCIATED WITH RUSTICITY and remoteness from the great centers of life. Yet there is possible a provincialism of mind, even in the finest cultural environment. One's special interests favor this. He may so narrow his mental concentration that his interest does not even cover a specific subject, but only a phase of it. In religion such a person is apt to become a mere dogmatist or theologian, at the expense of his Christianity. Here are two extracts from an article in *Zion's Herald*, by Terry B. Gordon, which are much to the point:

"Provincialism is not directed to the untrue, but to the unimportant. It is a false perspective, like that which a Chinese paints on a plate, where the man is larger than the bridge he crosses, and the bridge is larger than the castle it joins. The incorrect drawing of the picture of life crowds the foreground with details which are larger than the universe behind.

"The same defect of disproportion, or, in language of economics, the limitation of spiritual output, meets one as he traces the history of the Christian religion. A person unfamiliar with the mechanics of religion who should enter some Christian convocation and listen to the debates of Christian ministers might well find himself astonished by the narrow range of topics which seemed to command attention."

"Even the highest themes of religion may be provincially approached. The purposes of God and the destiny of man, though they are the subjects of contemplation which environ human life like an atmosphere, without which it is impossible to draw a full breath or to hold one's soul erect, may become unreal, uninteresting, unrefreshing, provincial. The habit of mind induced by theology easily develops into a detached and specialized way of thought, unrelated to the common duty of the world, and the theologian may discourse of the highest concerns in a language quite unintelligible to the common workaday world. Even theology is but a province of life,

though it be a province of lofty altitude and large horizon, and the air of these heights is to those who habitually dwell below not easy to breathe."

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC PARTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND was stunned by the rejection of the new Prayer Book in the House of Commons. The House of Lords had approved it by a vote of 241 to 88; but, contrary to expectation, the House of Commons, by 240 to 207, refused to do so, thus bringing to an inglorious end the long and intense campaign to foist upon English Protestantism what, in the words of Lord Hayter, "would undo the work of the Reformation."

What the result will be cannot be foreseen. The councils of the Anglo-Catholic party seem at this writing to be confused. We are indebted to *The Christian Advocate* for this concise putting of the crucial point in the whole question:

"In the House of Commons the opposition focussed on one point. The revised book authorized what is called 'the Reservation of the Sacrament.' Ostensibly this permits the minister, when administering the sacrament in the case of persons too ill to partake, to consecrate the elements, and 'reserve' them. This was regarded by some Protestants as opening the way for the Roman practice of the Adoration of the Host.

"In it seems to be implied the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, which holds that when consecrated by the priest the bread and wine become the actual body and blood of our Lord, and as such are an object of worship. This practice, which is condemned in the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, has crept into the Anglican Church and been observed, sometimes in defiance of the bishop, sometimes with his tacit approval. A large minority of Anglican clergymen, already contemptuous of the name of Protestant, are ready, or believed to be ready, to take advantage of this permissive provision in the revised book and to take the ell where the inch is granted. The *Methodist Recorder*, which agrees with the House of Commons, says:

"The passionate plea of the Anglo-Catholics for the Reserved Sacrament to be set up in a special tabernacle leads inevitably to the worship of the localized presence of Christ, however the bishops may seek to safeguard their own spiritual

interpretations of the Real Presence. The Bishop of Birmingham may have been a little crude in some of his questions concerning the consecrated bread and wine, but he could never be half so crude as a priesthood claiming to work a daily miracle by the repetition of a sacred formula.' ”

THE FIRST BATTLE OF THE MARNE, IN THE EARLY DAYS OF THE Great War, resulted in such an unexpected and serious setback for the Germans that men frankly credited it to a direct interposition of Providence. The equally unexpected defeat, by the House of Commons, of the bill approving the Revised Prayer Book has been received in similar spirit. Dr. Hutton illustrates this in these editorial remarks taken from *The British Weekly*:

“Perhaps the deepest and most religious thing we can say is just this—that it had to be. And wise men on both sides within the Church of England would do well to go away into some ‘desert of Arabia’ for a season and ponder what may be the ‘direction’ of this intervention within sight of ‘Damascus.’ The Church will survive which can read the signs, and will insist not upon any low and comfortable interpretation but on the interpretation which seems most pointedly to rebuke men and temporarily to hurt them.”

“But we cannot get beyond the feeling, and we are content with it, that here once again we have an event so unlikely before it happened, so seemingly inevitable now that it has happened, that the Church of England would do well to accept it as from God.”

ALTHOUGH THERE WAS NOTHING NEW IN THE RECENT ENCYCLICAL of Pope Pius XI, it came at a singularly opportune time respecting affairs in Great Britain. If one accepts the general premise, that the Roman is the only true church, then the deliverance is entirely understandable. The Pope is simply consistent with the traditional views of his church in his attitude toward the Protestant churches, since the latter can have no standing according to these views.

Coming as it did, however, close upon the heels of the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, it was the second recent

blow to be received by the Anglo-Catholic party in England. The Christian Century interprets this effect of the encyclical in the paragraph below:

"The encyclical was doubtless designed primarily as an answer to Lausanne, a warning to all Catholics against the dangers involved in fraternizing with the alien and the unbeliever, and a notification to Anglo-Catholics, that no matter what happens in England and the English church they cannot find a haven in Rome without making a complete submission. It also serves as a general announcement to all and sundry that Rome has abated nothing of her exclusive claim to be the sole custodian of the only means of salvation or of her refusal to give any sort of recognition to any form of Christianity other than her own. With reference to the Anglo-Catholic situation, the statement comes at a well chosen moment. The Malines conversations are a thing of the past and the vatican had already repudiated the thought that Cardinal Mercier's participation in them might imply any possibility of compromise. The Anglo-Catholics, stung by parliament's recent rejection of the alternative prayer-book, are already talking of disestablishment and it is more than likely that the more advanced of them are wondering on what terms they can lead the whole group over to Rome. Now they know. They can be received into the church of Rome on exactly the same terms as anybody else—that is, by becoming Romanists. High church Anglicanism, no matter how high, will not be counted to them for righteousness. Nothing counts but complete submission. It is well for them to know just where they stand, and now is the time when a fresh and clear statement may save false starts and embarrassing commitments."

THE SERIES OF ARTICLES ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH THAT HAVE been running in The Atlantic Monthly are so utterly frank and revealing that the editors of some periodicals would probably have hesitated to use them, especially if they had come from a non-Catholic source. But they are from the pen of "an American Roman Catholic clergyman of more than national prominence," as the Atlantic itself informs us, adding: "For over thirty years he has ministered to his large flock with gentle devotion and untiring zeal. Renowned for his intellectual

attainments, he has held a high and responsible position in his church."

The Preface, appearing with the first article, in January, was written by John Hearley, formerly in charge of the United Press Bureau in Rome. He does not identify the author of these remarkable criticisms, who wished them to appear anonymously, beyond stating that he had been "a prominent professor at a Catholic college in the West," and that "his public writings on religious subjects had enjoyed the episcopal imprimatur of approval" for thirteen years. However, he recounts in a most illuminating way the manner in which the manuscripts came into his hands.

In the opening paper this priest reveals a heart of sincere devotion to his church, spirituality of a high order, and a mind fully possessed of the acumen his theme demands. "Had I loved the Church less," he says at the outset, "my pen might have remained listless," and he continues:

"In fact, I have written not one word against my Church. The abuses which I attempt to delineate refer no more to the Church than they do to Christ. They are the barnacles which have grown on the bark of Peter through long centuries. I am writing, therefore, in the hope that those constituted in authority may come to see the necessity of dry-docking."

One of his greatest concerns, though he touches upon various abuses, is the whole Catholic educational system. He exhibits it marked by such intellectual provincialism, traditionalism, dogmatism, formalism, officialism, segregation, and abject submission, that the individual, in his inherent right to think for himself, is blotted out. Speaking of the education of priests he says:

"In all the years of his training the candidate for the priesthood must strive to mould his mentality to a fixed pattern. If he succeeds he is then said to possess the spirit of the priesthood. His whole seminary life is one of routine and formalism. Every hour of the day is regulated for him. He leads a community life, follows the group in his prayers, his studies, and all his activities. It is thought by these external

practices to develop a man of regular habits. It is a system little adapted to produce men of thought and individuality.

"The course of training for the priesthood is a narrowing process; it produces fixed ideas."

And again:

"Though they are yet in their early twenties, they are wise from their mediaeval studies. Though they have no experience of the world and its ways, they are aglow with the supernatural graces of the holy priesthood. They are fathers of the faithful. They have been sent to preach in the name of Christ—to preach the theological conclusions which they have learned by rote."

Then, after several pages more on the priesthood, he makes this statement:

"The priest submits humbly, abjectly, if he would maintain his standing. But many there are who rebel at heart. The world would be astounded did it know the number of priests who are struggling with the desire to remain faithful to the forms of ecclesiasticism while their very being cries out against the system. These are not the frivolous, not the careless, the negligent, or the unworthy. They are those who have broken through the fanatic wall that was built about them during the years of their seminary training. They are men who have burned the midnight oil, and through their travail have come to know the glorious privilege of independent thought. Such men see clearly that religion in the Catholic Church to-day has become a complex and intricate mass of laws, dogmas, and practices that little resemble the simple faith of the early centuries."

IT IS DOUBTFUL WHETHER, ASIDE FROM OUTBURSTS OF AN OVER-zealous patriotism, the parochial school system of the Roman Church has ever been so severely arraigned as in the second of the series of papers in *The Atlantic Monthly* upon various aspects of Roman Catholicism. Under the caption, *The Heresy of the Parochial School*, the unnamed priest to whom we have previously referred reveals the very great burden loyal Catholics in America have to bear in their school system. He also shows the handicap imposed by the church upon Catholic

youth. Let these selections speak for themselves—and let our Protestant educators consider the principles involved:

“The truth is, the activities of the Catholic Church in America have been diverted from their proper aim. Education has supplanted religion in its own sphere. The Church has become so institutionalized that it has been commercialized. It is already top-heavy. The financial burden is becoming almost unbearable to many. To support the ever-increasing number of institutions the martyr spirit is developed in the people. Poor souls, who must pay the public-school tax and at the same time meet the private-school assessment!

“It is unjust, they are told, yet they must bear it manfully. The excellence of the Catholic school is dinned into their ears continually. Nevertheless, many are growing skeptical. They are beginning to apply Christ’s test: ‘By their fruits ye shall know them.’ They are beginning to ask wherein these children who are nursed in the lap of Mother Church excel. None can maintain that they are more pious, more religious, than the children of generations which attended the public schools. There are just as many criminals, *pro rata*, emanating from the Catholic schools as from the public schools. There is as much *per capita* illicit drink consumed by Catholic alumni as by the unorthodoxly educated. There are proportionately as many moral scandals among those piously reared as among others.”

“The passing of religious training from the Catholic home has been gradual. Busy mothers found it easy to let the sisters teach the little ones to pray. In their devotion, too, they sometimes assumed that these pious religious were better fitted to teach their children morality.

“Indeed the sisters, who are ninety per cent of the Catholic teachers, are devoted and zealous in their work. There is nothing else but goodness and virtue in their penitential lives. Freely and gladly they expand themselves for the little ones of Christ. The more the pity, since they are unfitted for the work.

“The tenor of their lives incapacitates them for the mission to which they dedicate themselves. They have renounced the world to live in the seclusion of a convent. They would prepare the children for a life which, because of their profession, is unknown to themselves. Those who have renounced all family ties would teach the young to become the fathers and mothers of future generations. These good souls spend

their lives in following the routine of a rule, bound by blind obedience to the will of a superior. It is not strange, then, that the Catholic school is conducted on the routine system. All is drill. This is particularly true of the religious training."

"These devout teachers sin by excess. The children present an outlet for their own repressed lives. In their overzeal they become intellect and will to their pupils. They tell them what to do and what not to do, thinking that, by some miracle, the pupils will eventually learn to decide for themselves. Fine, overgrown boys must submit to this pious mothering. In fact, we are on the road to an American Catholic Church composed entirely of female-trained members.

"Female piety is too sweet for manly youths. We are already reaping the whirlwind of our schools. Many thoughtful priests are disturbed by the evident failure of the system, but they are the victims of circumstances. They may not, unscathed, voice their fears and doubts. They see the new generation drifting away from the practice of religion. The same spirit of revolt prevails among the parochial-school-bred as among others. Generally they end by putting the whole blame on this materialistic age, and letting it go at that."

"It seems evident that we are formulating a new idea of Catholic faith, a rationalizing faith. It is the popularization of theology. Our people are receiving a theologistic training. It is the new 'Americanism' in the Catholic Church. Its fault is that it fails to develop the intellect which it crams. It makes parrotlike Christians. It trains the youth in stereotyped arguments. It stunts the religious growth of its victims.

"The argumentation of our religious textbooks has changed but little since the sixteenth century. Doctrines are treated as though the world had not progressed these last three hundred years. This craze for doctrinal knowledge has perverted the historic Christian standard. Doctrinal knowledge—not virtuous living—is the norm of to-day."

"There is no reasonable argument against the theorem that religion is an everyday concern. But Christ never intended that His followers should spend five or six hours a day reviewing the mechanics of religion. In fact, He seems to have had no plans for a formulistic and theologistic religion such as is taught in these latter times. Not only are the minds of the children overburdened with religious teaching, but their eyes are surfeited with pietistic images. Holy pictures and statues are kept constantly before them."

"Human nature cannot bear all this religious formalism. It is like trying to develop a healthy appetite in a child by giving him thrice daily a one-piece diet of baken beans. It is a nutritious diet, but after a while the sight of beans would sicken the child.

"Indeed the enemies, real or imagined, of the Catholic Church in America may take heart as long as the Catholic school system flourishes. This system is doing more to make the old religion obnoxious than all its calumniators and opponents. When the Catholic child is six years old, he is taken to an inquisition as relentless as that over which presided the notorious Torquemada. More violence is done to tender souls by the intellectual rack of the parochial schoolroom than was done to the bodies of other victims in the past.

"The artificial religious life which Catholic education develops will not stand the test of modern conditions."

EDUCATORS, SOCIOLOGISTS, AND STUDENTS OF THE TIMES GENERALLY are continually pointing out the disadvantages if not dangers that come from the modern tendency to standardize and conventionalize everything. It is not only robbing us of individuality; it is sapping our moral independence.

The novelist or playwright who understands human nature is not likely to seek the models for his unique characters in the crowded centers, where fashions rule in thought and speech as well as in clothes. They are found amid sparse populations, where individuals are not shaken together so continually that characters all tend to a similar roundness and smoothness. Where men are not so herded they retain their distinguishing corners and edges.

But there is something more than this. It is not alone in the jostling crowd that individuality, and with it self-reliance, is worn away. Moral and spiritual independence must naturally atrophy wherever our thinking is done for us. Here we put the responsibility for decisions upon an organization or upon a system we have adopted. Writing in *The Outlook*, upon *The Crutch of Authority*, Ernest Hamlin Abbott says, upon this disposition to avoid our own decisions and responsibilities:

"The desire to shift responsibility to some one else is not confined to the ignorant or the uneducated. It is by no means necessarily a mark of intellectual inferiority. It is sometimes a sign of a lack of self-confidence, of a low valuation of one's own judgment. Weariness may result from a long-continued effort in making difficult decisions, especially in the face of opposition or indifference, as it may result from any effort. Sometimes, therefore, the desire to shift responsibility is simply the sign of a tired will. But, whatever the cause, the desire to escape responsibility for decisions is an experience that comes sooner or later to most of us.

"Among many this desire is not an occasional experience, but a constitutional trait. It may even become a habit, a conviction, a creed. Wherever morality is accepted as an external code, laid down for us by a Church or a Book, this desire to yield one's will becomes a form of religion.

"This is what Sabatier has well named the religion of authority. It is what is meant by many people when they speak of Christianity. Indeed, it seems hard for Europeans, among whom state religion has prevailed either in a Catholic or in a Protestant form, to think of religion in any other way. A recent scholarly book on 'Christianity,' by Charles Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity in the University of Paris—a book already referred to in these columns—is based wholly on this conception of Christianity as a religion of code and creed.

"When Sigmund Freud, the Viennese psychologist who originated psychoanalysis, says, in a small book recently published abroad, that man must abandon religion and for it substitute science, he appears to be thinking of religion as a form of authority. If that is what he means, he has gone no further than many other scientists who yet see in the free mind of man a place for faith. Whether he means more than this or not, he certainly means at least that with the coming of science there has passed the day of the religion of authority. And yet such is the irony of human affairs, these very words of Freud will be accepted as a creed or dogma by many of his followers. As among all other classes of mankind, so among Freudians, there are those who will accept the great man's decisions and dicta as valid for them. To such as these among his followers Freud himself is the pope. They simply substitute one religion of authority for another."

TO ANYONE WHO GIVES A MOMENT'S THOUGHT TO CHRISTIAN history the present atheistic campaign against the faith, the Bible, and the church may well cause a smile. It may even arouse hope, for active opposition has ever been a tonic for true Christianity, and the church surely needs something today to awaken it from its ease and move it to shake off its lethargy. Such efforts as that of the Anti-Bible Society even stir up the secular mind, as this editorial comment in *The New York Sun* shows:

"Militant foes of Holy Writ, leagued in the Anti-Bible Society, announce that they intend 'to get the Gideon Bibles out of the hotels of America.' The objects of their crusade are the copies of the Scriptures distributed gratuitously by a society of Christians which takes its name from that son of Joash who, acting in obedience to the Lord's commands, put to flight the Midianites by the hill of Moreh. To exclude the Bible from hotel chambers is a crude method of combating its influence. Obviously, if its contents do not interest hotel guests they will not read it, and if they do find it interesting they will obtain it regardless of the Gideons. The Anti-Bible Society should adopt more subtle tactics. For example, let its geniuses compose and compile a book exceeding its appeal to human minds disciplined, undisciplined, cultivated, uncultivated, gentle, rough, gay, depressed, astute, simple, the appeal to the world, and distribute it as the Gideons distribute the volume of their choice. Having brought into being such a work, the Anti-Bible Society will have no difficulty in obtaining lodgment for it in hotels on the same terms on which those establishments now house the Bible, and the rest may be left to the discrimination of the guests."

IT IS NOT OUTSIDE THE TRUTH TO SAY THAT THE BEST INFLUENCE of the Bible is sometimes hindered by its very defenders. Though they do not say so, they often appear to feel that the Bible is in danger of going down under the attacks upon it unless its believers keep up a continual and vigorous defense. The uproar thus produced diverts attention from the great message itself. As Bishop Manning said in an introduction to a recent book, *The Word Abideth*, "We need have no fear that scholarly investigation will destroy or weaken the authority of

this book. The true test of the Bible lies in its reverent and faithful use, and in sincere effort to follow its teachings."

In an editorial *The Press*, of Paterson, New Jersey, illustrates the endurance of the Bible by this comparison and incident:

"Imagine a statement something like this in the year 2027: 'Of course I know about Mary Jones, but who was this fellow Napoleon?' A trifle far-fetched, we admit. But the exaggeration is defensible. Napoleon's light is growing feebler with the passing of the years. He was not only a dismal failure, for all his glory, but the man in recent times who tried to imitate him failed as signally. The Napoleon complex is about over. But the Mary Jones idea is gathering weight and momentum every year.

"Mary Jones lived contemporaneously with Napoleon, even though you may never have heard of her. It is certain the great conqueror never heard of her, and it is likely she never heard of him; for she was only a child. She started out one day from her Welsh village and, barefoot, tramped across the hills, asking for a Bible. And that small incident started a movement which has not yet subsided—the Bible Society. And out of the Bible Society came new life for the Sunday school. And from the Sunday schools of the British Isles and the United States have gone millions of Mary Joneses and Johnny Joneses to build a world more real than any ever dreamed of by Napoleon."

A SURPRISING AMOUNT OF INTEREST IN THE JEWS HAS DEVELOPED within the past decade, if one is to judge by the new literature on that race. Religion is the foremost topic, particularly the Jewish attitude toward Christ. There is a growing disposition on the part of the Jews to learn about Him, and this of course means a wonderful opportunity for the church.

A new and attractive magazine bears the significant name, *Jews and Christians*, and is edited by B. A. M. Schapiro. In the initial number Rev. Amos I. Dushaw contributes an article upon Hebrew Christian Literature, which has this passage:

"There are those in the Church who are interested in the salvation of Israel, and they are asking as to ways and means of getting the best results from their efforts. They see vast

numbers of Jews drifting away from their ancestral faith into modernism and infidelity. They also see that Jews take little or no interest in the Church. But they also notice this—that the same Jews who care little for the Synagogue and less for the Church, have more than an ordinary interest in Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus is no longer anathema in Jewish circles, and seldom do we find to-day among the intelligent Jews any who speak disrespectfully of Jesus. They claim Him as their own and indulge in criticism of Christians for not living up to the ideals of the Christ of the Gospels and Epistles. Jews of intelligence are demanding of Christians that they be loyal to Jesus. This was an unheard of thing a generation ago. In those days Jesus was anathema in Jewish circles—to-day Jesus is gaining ground very rapidly among His own people.

“In connection with those new facts facing us everywhere, the approach to the Jew must be along different lines than it was a generation ago. The citation of certain isolated texts from the Bible to prove the Messiahship of Jesus is a matter of the past. Jesus is never to them the fulfillment of a verse here and there—He fulfills the ideals of the entire Old Testament.”

THE OPENING OF ANOTHER TOMB BY THE ARCHEOLOGISTS HAS revealed again man's tragic and pathetic effort to find some way of his own to circumvent the last enemy. The ancient King of Ur, whose resting place has lately yielded its secrets, had sought to take with him on the final journey various persons and animals considered essential to the royal happiness, and their remains have been found with his.

But there was another resident of Ur, far better known to history than this king, and The New York Times editorially thus comments on his passing:

“The First Citizen of Ur of the Chaldees was not like this selfish King. For to him had been vouchsafed the gift of spirituality, and when Abraham was gathered to his fathers he made the journey alone.”

THE MEANS FOR DOING A THING SOMETIMES HAVE A VERY DISTINCT influence on the thing itself. The radio furnishes an example. To realize that one is speaking to thousands, per-

haps millions, in every walk of life and holding all sorts of opinions, has its effect on the speaker. Unless one is constitutionally fanatical or antagonistic, he instinctively seeks to avoid giving offense. This feeling may easily weaken the force of his message. This warning from *The Watchman-Examiner* is by no means uncalled for:

"Let pastors who preach to radio audiences beware that they do not make their sermons so impersonal as to be valueless. Thinking of their widely scattered and invisible audiences, it is possible that they may preach less directly and less simply than if their own audience were seated before them. T. DeWitt Talmadge had a great audience which went to pieces when he died. It is charged and perhaps justly, that one reason for this was that through the printed page he preached to the world rather than to his local congregation. The local congregation on the other hand, needed homelier advice than would look well on the printed page. It is true beyond question that a church often needs plain, simple, unvarnished truth that is not particularly adapted to general audiences scattered abroad. It seems to us that all of this has some application to radio preaching. Happy should be the pastors who speak before microphones, but we warn them not to neglect their own church family in doing so."

THE EAGER PURSUIT OF DEGREES IN THE AMERICAN ACADEMIC world has not escaped deserved criticism. The doctorate is becoming so common as almost to cease to be a mark of any great distinction. One really does not even have to be a true specialist in anything to attain this honor. After the degree is conferred he may straightway forget the most he has learned concerning the subject of his thesis, but he will continue to be "Doctor" nevertheless.

The outstanding weakness of the whole system is, that it tends to fix attention on a mark of academic recognition rather than on solid achievement. Of course, men of true scholarly instincts will follow their researches, degree or no degree. Not only so, but a true scholar is just as surely recognized as he would be in a degreeless world, whether or not certain alphabetical fragments trail after his name.

But then this is human nature, and most people suffer from the same or similar infections, marked by outbreaks of prefixes, suffixes, labels, buttons, medals or ribbons. An article on this theme, contributed to *Vanity Fair* by Deems Taylor, has been condensed by *The Reader's Digest*, and from this version we give these extracts:

"Nobody really loves to be surrounded by equals. He wishes a few superiors (luckier than he, but no better) to whose estate he may aspire, and lots of inferiors."

"It seems incredible that men should struggle and suffer and lose sleep and work overtime for the privilege of sticking a small bit of scarlet ribbon in their coat lapels, but they will, and do. The Frenchman who yearns for distinction has not only the *Legion d'Honneur* as a possible goal; he has the *Institut*, the *Academie*, and a host of minor orders and decorations to reward his every degree of excellence (I once visited the Somme front under the escort of a lieutenant who was wearing the Order of Agricultural Merit). Indeed I have an idea that among the factors that have kept the French, on the whole, content with their democratic lot have been their unbounded opportunities for escaping from it.

"Germany runs more to degrees and professional titles. Over there, 'Doctor' and 'Professor' are taken seriously, and their use, when deserved, is virtually compulsory. In fact the German takes considerable pride in prefixing his name with almost any title of office to which he is entitled, and even bestows it upon his wife. It is no laughing matter, beyond the Rhine, to be 'Mrs. President of the Board of Aldermen Biedenhofers,' or 'Mrs. Assistant Tax Commissioner Schmidt.'

"Aside from their titles of nobility, the English have a passion for initials, which, reversing the German custom, they place after their names. The country is rich in honorary organizations, whose initials the members are not only privileged, but expected to use."

"The Italians are less generously supplied than the French with titles for the common man, but they have them. The Spanish have several orders of merit, and the Spanish-Americans make up for their lack by a copious use of university degrees and memberships in clubs and charitable organizations. Almost anything goes in a pinch. I have actually been shown the visiting card of an unfortunate Cuban gentleman who,

made desperate by lack of other affiliations, had been driven to place 'subscriber to the London Times' under his name.

"Of course, as two-fisted, red-blooded Americans, we laugh at all this foreign snobbishness."

"In reality, however, we are no more emancipated than the Europeans whom we patronize. Like them, we yearn to wear the insignia of some honorable and exclusive organization, some order of Knighthood in which our membership may arouse the envy of our less favored fellows. Failing the existence of any such orders under governmental auspices, we have, perforce made up our own. No other country in the world has so many secret societies, fraternal and benevolent orders, institutes of this, and academies of that, self-bestowed titles and honorary degrees. Once the American citizen manages to get some handle to his name, he hangs on to it like grim death."

"This country swarms with Supreme High Potentates, Grand Masters, Exalted Rulers, Wizards, Magisters, Archons, and Caliphs. The rolls of the College of Heraldry, the *Almanach de Gotha*, and the *Arabian Nights* have been ransacked to find sufficiently impressive epithets to apply to otherwise unimpressive citizens."

THE QUESTION, WHETHER TO BE OR NOT TO BE A COLLEGE STUDENT, is engaging more attention every year. Nor is the discussion wholly in the hands of educational leaders. We occasionally hear from the nonprofessional person who has gone through college, and even from one who has not.

One of the latter told his reasons for being glad he was not a college man to J. George Frederick who gave them in *The Outlook*. Here are two quite straightforward paragraphs from the reasons why one man did not enter college:

"More and more I am convinced that college is not for a man of my temperament, and I am very well aware that if I had followed my chums to Princeton I would neither have taken my studies seriously nor developed my talents (such as they are) as effectively as at present. And, what is more, I would have acquired some very serious handicaps in point of view and habit. Several times in the last year I have read statements from college presidents, themselves, flatly stating that too many young men go to college nowadays, and that most of them would be better off if they went to work. In fact, it was

another statement by the President of Harvard University on this subject which finally clinched my decision. I learn best by actual contact with people and tasks, and I am too easily led not to fall a prey to some of the idling tendencies of college. It is a sheer piece of luck for me that my father was not a wealthy man. I am amazed when some of my chums come to see me now to note the comparative emptiness of their brains compared with the mental interest, the discipline, the judgment, and the sense of responsibility which I have developed since I began to work."

"I don't want to be misunderstood; if I were cut out to be a professional man, or had engineering ambitions or a gift for some other intellectual pursuit, no doubt college would have been a good thing for me. But I don't want to be a lawyer, doctor, scientist, minister, writer, or college professor; therefore the sooner I get into contact with life and learn how to do things, the better, after seventeen or eighteen years of age. If I had been more studiously inclined, college might have been all right for me, because I would have carried away valuable knowledge. As it is, I am practically certain that I should have continued, like so many others, just to 'skin through'; having precious little to show for four years on the credit side, but a lot of things to unlearn on the debit side. I believe in college men in business; but in college men *who have brought something out of college.*"

THAT A CHANGE OF ATTITUDE IN THE MATTER OF SENDING young folks to college is coming over the country seems evident from numerous published discussions. The opinion gains ground, that it is rather the exceptional young person who is benefited in the long run by a liberal education. Were the conditions of life ideal this would be different. It is useless, often worse, to ignore the realities in the nature, life, and prospects of the student. Otherwise the four years at college may prove a real hindrance to a useful career.

In Scribner's Magazine Dean Gauss of Princeton has given a very practical paper on the whole question, a section of which The Reader's Digest thus reproduces:

"If, nowadays, you give a boy of 18 the option of going into his father's office or of going to college, he will in almost every case choose college. In many cases a continuation of

education in college is certainly preferable, often essential—if he is to be a lawyer, a doctor, an engineer, a scholar. In a good many other cases it is, however, far preferable, if you are thinking of your son's later success in life, that he should immediately put himself into harness and develop his sense of responsibility and begin his climb up the world's long ladder. This is what we have forgotten today. It is this simple psychological fact that is resulting in an unfortunate rush for admission. Of the 600,000 young men now in college, it would possible have been better in nearly 100,000 cases, had they not come. Had the money which each of these boys will spend been invested for him and had he immediately entered the ranks of the economically productive, he and the world would have been far better for it. There is, of course, no reason why a boy who plans to enter the business world should not go to college. It will enhance the value of his later leisure and give him something to think about 'when the long winter evenings come.' But no father should urge his son to go to college for the social prestige it will give, or for any other reason than that for which the college exists, which is to train the mind by exercising it in study."

BOOKS

JUDAISM IN THE FIRST CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA ¹

PROFESSOR MOORE's book appears at an opportune time, in view of the widespread interest in the Jews at present. It will be carefully studied as being the result of thirty years of labor on the part of the Professor of the History of Religion at Harvard.

The book is in a sense the great work of the author's career, and at the same time bids fair to become the definite work on this particular phase of the history of the Jews. It is imposing in size alone, filling two volumes of more than a thousand pages, while only a glance at the abundant references to the sources gives an impression of the painstaking research which has preceded the writing. Still a third volume is projected, which is to be filled with notes on points only referred to in the present text, the references to these notes being included in the first volume but not in the second. The two volumes, therefore, are commended to us for study for many reasons—timeliness, authority, thorough treatment, and accuracy.

The author's attitude toward his subject may be described as critical, but on the whole sympathetic. Throughout the work there is evident a desire to be perfectly fair to the men of the period with which he deals. As a matter of fact, an admiration for them seems discernible many times, not in express statement, but by implication. They are compared favorably with the religious thinkers outside Judaism; they are freed from misunderstandings which the author thinks have caused them loss of reputation; Jesus is frequently pointed out as simply being one with them in thought and method, and their teachings are put in a most favorable light.

¹ Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim. By George Foot Moore, Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. Vol. I, pp. xii+552; Vol. II, pp. viii+487. Indexes.

This does not mean that Professor Moore accepts their premises about religion, nor does it mean that he approves the methods of exegesis used by them; but it is plain that he has the highest regard for the motives and character of the men who may be called the leading figures of Judaism. These men are shown, and we think rightly to some extent, as earnest, sincere, and moved by deep convictions. Their lives are represented as being worthy of their professions in the main. They had a great principle to which they were consistently loyal. They developed a religion far beyond other religions of the time in depth and purity. One can only give expression, as he contemplates Judaism at its best, to a thought which the author does not mention, viz., Who can make these bones live? After surveying the whole of this wide field, there is left the impression of great wistfulness in even the finest that it has to offer. The evangelical Christian can gratefully recall that he is the heir to all the excellencies of this faith of God's chosen people, while he gives thanks that he bears within himself the fruitful power to translate precept into practice.

What now does the author mean by the Judaism which it is his purpose to describe? His aim is "to represent Judaism in the centuries in which it assumed definite form, as it presents itself in the tradition which it has always regarded as authentic" (vol. I, p. vii). This form was attained at about the close of the second century of our era. The period under consideration is the age of the Tannaim, *i.e.*, "Traditioners" or "Teachers," and it extends from the time of Herod to the time of the Patriarch Judah. The interest of the subject, therefore, lies in the fact that this period coincides with the birth and spread of the Christian church; in a sense Christianity came out of the Judaism of the age of the Tannaim.

The discussion begins with an Introduction of 216 pages, in which Part I is given to a historical sketch, and Part II to an elaborate analysis of the sources. The history begins with Ezra, who has assumed such considerable importance in the Old Testament criticism of the day. Professor Moore accepts the current views as to the origin of the Pentateuch and the

early history of Israel; the religion of Israel and Judaism are two very different things, the latter having its rise after the Captivity. Contrary to the opinions of many critics, he regards Judaism as a very decided improvement on the pre-exilic religion of the Jews. It began, not so much with the introduction of the Priests' Code, as with the scribes, who became important from the time of Ezra onward.

"It is here, and not in the introduction of the Priests' code, which would presumably have tended in quite the opposite direction, that Judaism as we know it has its antecedents" (vol. I, p. 42).

Furthermore, the Babylonian influence on Judaism during the exile has not the importance attached to it by many scholars.

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that, whatever part Babylonian Jews returning to Jerusalem may have had in the restoration or subsequently, the Judaism which is the subject of our present study was not a new kind of religion introduced from Babylonia, but a normal and fruitful growth on Palestinian soil" (vol. I, p. 16).

A growth out of the ancient religion of Israel, and yet a religion distinct from it, is the conception of Judaism we must hold. Where lies the distinction that separates the new from the old? It (Judaism) "made religion in every sphere a personal relation between the individual man and God, and in bringing this to clear consciousness and drawing its consequences lies its most significant advance beyond the older religion of Israel" (vol. I, p. 121). Yet it is to be borne in mind that the idea of the religious community was not abandoned; the individual remained a part of the group in all his new responsibility. This solidarity gave to Judaism the strength to survive the seventeen centuries since it took form, in contrast with all its contemporaries. It "became in the full sense personal religion without ceasing to be national religion" (vol. I, p. 121).

Into the discussion of sources we do not now enter, except to note the various classes. Naturally the commentaries them-

selves are the first and most important of them; these are described and outlined, and the authorities where the most reliable translations are found are given in each case. Among extraneous sources are found the book of Sirach, the Psalms of Solomon, the Acts, and the Synoptic Gospels; these last are dated after 70 A.D., with the possible exception of Mark. As sectarian sources, there are the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Book of Jubilees. The books of Maccabees and Josephus are historical sources, together with the writings of Philo. A separate chapter is given to prayers, as revealing the religious views of the rabbis. In an interesting chapter on critical principles the author lays down the valuable rule, that Judaism is to be judged first of all by those works which it has itself always regarded as authoritative, a rule that may well be commended to all who undertake the analysis of such a historical subject as this, or the Christian church.

The main body of this work is divided into seven parts, not all distinct divisions, but phases which blend at times. Part I is the heart of the subject. Its title is *Revealed Religion*. The key phrase of this section and of the whole of the two volumes is "the logic of revealed religion."

"The foundation of Judaism is the belief that religion is revealed. What man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man, he has made known in one form or another by revelation." (Vol. I, p. 112.)

"The characteristic thing in Judaism at the beginning of our era is not its resemblance to a church, but that it conceived itself as revealed religion, and drew all the consequences of this conception. God had not only made himself known to men, but had given them in his twofold law a revelation of his will for man's whole life, and of the way of salvation through the fulfilment of his righteous and holy will." (Vol. I, p. 235.)

These statements give in the author's words the central truth around which all else in Judaism is to be gathered. The Scriptures, as the revelation of God and His will, become at once inspired and authoritative. The interpretation of the Scriptures in tradition and in the unwritten law is at once a

work of greatest significance; the Law is perfect and unchangeable and can never pass away. The synagogue became the means of instruction of the people in this revelation.

"Its origin is unknown, but it may be reasonably surmised that it had its antecedents in spontaneous gatherings of Jews in Babylonia and other lands of their exile . . . to confirm one another in fidelity to their religion in the midst of heathenism" (vol. I, p. 283).

The schools were a second great institution for the preservation of the true religion. Finally the conversion of the Gentiles, by absorption into the nation of Israel, became the natural mission of a people who were thus in possession of a unique word from God. All these lines of thought are developed in Part I, a chapter being given to each.

To this same controlling principle the author returns in all the subsequent sections. Part II has for its subject The Idea of God. Judaism did not construct any systematic arrangement of its doctrine, and for the modern student to do so is to create an impression of order not to be found in the writings themselves. All that we do find there is a consensus of opinion. These opinions were of course based on the Scriptures, but not all Scripture was employed without discrimination, for unconsciously those passages were taken which were most in accord with their own highest ideas of God. In all their use of Scripture this selective principle is in evidence. Nor is it true to say simply that the Jews of this period selected the best in their Scriptures, for they had gone farther still in the development of their doctrines. (See Vol. I, p. 359.) What then, did they think and teach about God? In chapter II of this second part, the character of God is described. The two essentials are justice and mercy; the emphasis placed on the second of these by the men of that age will be a surprise to those accustomed to think none too highly of the God of Judaism.

"A theme with many repetitions and variations is that the world would never have been created and could not endure if justice were to rule in it untempered by mercy" (vol. I, p. 389).

"For Jewish apprehension justice and mercy are not jealous attributes between which God is somehow distracted, but complementary aspects of his character which are harmoniously exhibited in his moral government of the world and his particular providence" (vol. I, p. 393).

In chapter v, on The Majesty and Accessibility of God, two other characteristics are developed.

"The prophets and psalmists would have been surprised to hear that when they called God 'king,' the word connoted the arbitrariness of a tyrant and the jealously guarded seclusion of a despot" (vol. I, p. 432).

They did believe in a God who rules the world for His own ends, whose plan was wise and unalterable; and by this belief they were borne up in the midst of catastrophe, just as others have been in later times.

It will be found that the remaining five parts of this work gather round the same idea of revealed religion. Part III, on The Nature of Man, shows how the teaching on this subject likewise is based on the logic of revealed religion; man is a sinner before God, and the only way of return to Him from whom he has revolted is repentance. The chapter on Repentance will be found profitable by anyone who studies it, both for the depth of the need of man which was felt by these Jewish teachers and for the inadequacy of the way out which many a Christian reader will assuredly feel. Part V deals with Religious Observances, such as the Sabbath, the feasts, public facts, and the attitude toward civil government; and here the author shows how many of these, especially the Sabbath, have been misunderstood. (See Vol. II, pp. 38 f.) Part VI deals with Morals. The basis on which the Jewish doctors handled this subject is put thus:

"The Law was not for the Jewish Doctors of the Law merely a *Corpus Juris*, a volume of statutes on all kinds of subjects, ritual and ceremonial, criminal and civil; it was—to give it modern expression—a revelation of God's ideal for men's conduct and character" (vol. II, p. 146).

Again the logic of revealed religion. Part VII, on Piety, has the same organizing principle in view.

The subject of the last part is the Hereafter, and it may be supposed that many readers will turn to it with great interest. It need only be said here, that the section contains a thorough discussion of the pertinent literature, including the book of Revelation, and that this is followed by three chapters, one on life after death, one on Messianic expectations, and one on eschatology. These apocalypses were ignored by the rabbis; it is the author's opinion that their effect on religious thinking has been greatly exaggerated. There was nothing that could be called an authoritative opinion on these subjects. According to Akiba the reading of such books would cost a man his place in the world to come. (Vol. II, p. 281.) Speaking of the attitude of the rabbis after 70 A.D. Professor Moore says:

"There is a noteworthy reticence, an evident disposition not to be wise beyond what is written, a sobriety in striking contrast to the enthusiastic constructions of the apocalypses" (vol. II, p. 346).

In addition to what has been said as to the contents of these volumes we may note finally that at the end of the second volume there are excellent indexes which render the whole work useful to the student.

The question of greatest import to many a reader of this work will be the relation of Christianity to the Judaism here portrayed. Professor Moore takes for granted the present position of criticism as to Old and New Testaments alike. His findings will therefore be variously judged. For him the Jewish doctrine of revealed religion is man's invention; Jesus and His disciples were the products of Judaism; Paul was the inventor of what has been regarded as evangelical Christianity. To some of his readers the facts brought out tell a different story.

This difference of opinion need not prevent our recognition of the great value of this impartial, painstaking picture of this great religion and its leading exponents. Even the lay reader

will find this a clear and readable presentation of the subject, and he may be sure that he has the facts. No one can read these volumes without admiration for the zeal for God, the strength of purpose, the sincerity of the men who made Judaism what it is here shown to be. That it produced a fine type of piety and a lofty idealism, we cannot for a moment doubt. But that we must stop with Judaism, fine as it is, we cannot believe. With the deepest sympathy we can join the Apostle in saying that the receiving back of this people will be "life from the dead."

PAUL F. BARACKMAN.

NEW STUDIES IN MYSTICAL RELIGION ²

ANY studies in the field of mysticism conducted by Professor Rufus Jones are sure to be widely read; for he is the greatest champion of mystical religion in America who holds the entire intellectual respect of scholars, and he is the best known intellectual leader in this field among the Quakers. The chapters in this book were originally given as a course of lectures at Union Theological Seminary, New York, during the spring of 1927.

The reviewer was fortunate enough to hear these lectures, and is glad to record the interest which they aroused. The first was given in the music room, the customary place for such lectures, but it proved too small to hold the audience, so the spacious seminary chapel was opened for the second lecture, and it was filled through the whole series. No higher commendation for the author and his subject need be sought.

The six chapters of the book bear the same titles as did the lectures, and are the same as delivered, unless there have been some minor revisions for the printed page. These titles are: *Mystical Religion and the Abnormal*. *Mysticism and Asceticism*. *Mysticism and Religious Education*. *The Bearing of*

² *New Studies in Mystical Religion*. By Rufus Jones, Litt.D., D.D., LL.D., D.Theol., Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College. The Ely Lectures, delivered at Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1927. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 205.

Mystical Experience on Organization and System. Mystical Experience and Organization. The Testimony of the Soul.

From the order of these subjects, it is evident that Professor Jones realized that he was on the defensive; so he frankly faces at the outset the two phases of the problem which are certain to create most of the difficulties in the modern mind, Mysticism and the Abnormal, and Mysticism and Asceticism. Then he moves onward through the problems indicated. To understand Professor Jones' conception of mystical religion we will turn to the last chapter, for mystical religion is based upon the testimony of the soul, and its reliability. So we read:

"Whenever the soul in its sanity and rationality bears witness to the truth, it testifies to a deeper Reality with which it is allied, and which binds our fragmentary knowing self to the eternal nature of things" (p. 182).

This point is further developed as follows:

"We can *know* only in so far as we are more than we appear to be in our isolation and finiteness. There is a spiritual foundation under our feet. One may as well talk of the music and harmony of a single note as to talk of the *truth* which a single, sundered, finite, insulated mind *knows*." (P. 182.)

In this passage we are able to feel the influence of Professor James and his "stream of consciousness" idea. So we are not surprised to find him philosophizing in the next paragraph on the nature of *subject* and *object*, and making this observation:

"Objects are certainly not 'presented' to subjects across unbridged chasms. Subject and object are intelligible only as aspects within one deeper unified consciousness. There is a foundational spiritual reality within us that underspans, or overarches, the differentiation of subject and object." (P. 183.)

This is, of course, a return almost to Professor James' exact words. However, we are now not concerned either with the philosophy or psychology of Professor Jones' theory, but with its testimony. And this is as follows:

"We have our experiences of *value*, of beauty, of truth, and

of goodness, just because we are not single-level, one-track beings. We are quite willing to be told that we are curiously carved pieces of the earth's crust, or strange dust-wreath vortices, if we may add to the account *the something more which we know we are.*" (P. 188 f.)

This "something more which we know we are," is described in the following quotations:

"Desires and strivings, visions and ideals, emotions and sentiments, are as much a genuine part of us as are the iron and lime and phosphorus in our bodies. We have insights of what ought to be, appreciations of beauty, convictions of truth, experiences of love, and these things are not part of the earth's crust. They are not physical realities. . . . They are real for mind and only for mind. But they are not purely *subjective*. They refer to some reality beyond the individual. They are not arbitrary. They are not capricious. They are not visionary. It is by them that we truly live." (P. 189.)

The heart of this part of spiritual experience is thus explained:

"They are revealed through us rather than created by us. They *find* us. They awaken us. They break in upon us from beyond us. They call us forth to be organs of their revealing. They enrich us. They expand us. They help us to realize our lives as nothing else does. They point to a world of a higher type than that of matter, a world closely linked with our minds but at the same time overarching and vaster." (P. 189 f.)

So we move to the next step:

"It is this capacity in us for overpassing what *is* and of living forward into what ought to be that makes us essentially religious beings. We are endowed with vision for more inclusive wholes than any our eyes have seen, and so long as we preserve our fundamental nature as men we shall be religious, we shall keep on our quest for God, and we shall enjoy our glimpses of Him." (P. 191 f.)

We are now at the point where the religious contribution of mysticism can be stated:

"This mystical capacity in us, this capacity for another kind of world than that in space and composed of matter,

underlies, as I have said, both our highest moral and religious attainments. It is *that* which has made us moral and religious beings, and it would in some measure survive any disaster which might sweep away all our codified laws and existent institutions, even all our sacred books and creeds and churches." (P. 195.)

Let us follow this idea a little further:

"God is to be found and known, not in terms of astronomy, but rather in terms of our noblest ethical and spiritual aspirations. He is best revealed by what is best in man. In his deepest nature man is spirit, and so is in very truth made in the image of God and on the way toward Him. . . . God in fact is all that we are striving to be. To find Him we do not need to travel off into space or backward in time, but rather to go down to profounder levels of spiritual life." (P. 195 ff.)

This leads to a very important conclusion:

"No one can be a *person* in the full meaning of the word and not partake of God, the complete Spirit, any more than a river can be a river without partaking of the ocean, or than an atom can be an atom without partaking of electrical energy" (p. 196).

This exaltation of personality becomes an important channel of knowledge, knowledge of truth, knowledge of goodness, knowledge of all the great spiritual values, but especially knowledge of God. So we read:

"All the knowledge of God which is possessed by men has come to us in the last resort through some human consciousness of Him. Each great religious tradition, when we follow it back, is seen to originate in the special experiences of some soul who has acted as the revealer of spiritual reality." (P. 204.)

The book closes with this consistently mystical passage:

"Perhaps some day we in the West will learn the secret which India has always possessed—that the soul is the eternally important fact and its testimony the ground of all truth" (p. 204).

With this fundamental grounding in the principles of religious mysticism, the reader will be interested to follow Pro-

fessor Jones through the problems to which the other chapters of the book are devoted; and the resulting religious stimulus will be very marked. Having taken such a firm stand upon the reality and reliability of the testimony of the soul, it now becomes necessary to meet in the field of modern psychology and philosophy the challenge which insists that the soul and its testimony be interpreted in more intelligent modern terms. Until this is done, mysticism will not make much headway in intellectual circles. This, of course, the mystic is not interested in doing, for he insists that mysticism is a way of knowing all its own. But, for those who feel the intellectual instability of any secret and unpsychological source of knowledge, this is imperative.

Psychology of religion has not yet completed its study in this field, but it is making great advances at the present time, and when its work is done the religious consciousness of the mystic will be better understood. For all evidence points to the fact that religious experience is one of the primary experiences of the human being.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

VOLTS FROM A LAYMAN'S DYNAMO³

I POSITIVELY decline to place the actual heading of Dr. Magoun's book (indicated in the footnote) as a title for this review. And this for several reasons. In addition to its coarseness, which, on general principles brought me almost to the point of refusing to review the book at all, the epithet is one which is used by unfeeling people to point the finger of scorn at those unfortunate members of society who are most unjustly made to suffer for their parents' wrongdoing. I really wonder if Dr. Magoun has not advanced to the modern, and I think in this instance Christian, point of view that there

³ Volts from a Layman's Dynamo. Volume II. Messiah or Bastard: Which? By Herbert W. Magoun, Ph.D. (Johns Hopkins), Editor of *Asuri-Kalpa* (Sanskrit) and *Mexican Linguistics*. Boston: Hamilton Brothers. 1927. Pp. 263. Index.

are no illegitimate children in the world, only illegitimate parents?—I can hardly believe it.

My personal belief is that Dr. Magoun or his publishers have caught the prevalent journalistic infection which selects the most sensational titles within easy reach for books which in themselves are not sensational at all. This may be good "salesmanship," as it is called, but has little else to recommend it. Again, I am unwilling to admit that those who find themselves unable for one reason or another to accept the New Testament story of our Lord's birth are driven by an inevitable logic to this repellant hypothesis.

That the denial of the Gospel story leaves us in an unsatisfactory position of ignorance and doubt concerning the birth of Jesus I pointed out more than twenty years ago, but that does not involve us in Dr. Magoun's dilemma—either this or this. And the evidence drawn from the career of Jesus and that of His family according to the flesh in the church may confidently be relied upon to drive this silly and impossible suggestion back to the cellars and alleys where it belongs.

There is another and important, though secondary, reason why I dislike this title—it tends to conceal the fact that Dr. Magoun has written a very earnest and able book. I have tried out this title on visitors to my office sufficiently to be assured that the reaction of right-minded people is quite uniformly one of disgust and repulsion. Having spoken so severely of the title, it is perhaps no more than fair to give Dr. Magoun's justification for it. He says at the end of his Preface:

"If the title seems a bit startling, the conditions that called it forth are no less so; for they render it impossible to mince matters, and the courageous attitude is to face things as they are. There has accordingly been no dodging either in the title or the text."

The reader may, at this point, be allowed to make his own decision. The reviewer's is now on record.

There are twelve chapters in the book, the first of which states the case. Of the eleven which follow two deal with one

the Trinity (II and III); three with the personality of Jesus, the sources of His power, and His self-estimate (IX, VI, X); one with the general question of miracles (VII); one with the Old Testament (VIII); one with the meaning of the cross (XI); while one (XII) is devoted to the Conclusion. The two which remain (IV and V) deal with the relationship of Joseph to Jesus and with the two genealogies. It will be seen at a glance that Dr. Magoun does not attempt to deal with the question of the Virgin Birth in isolation as a single historical or critical problem. Two chapters only (IV and V) are given directly to this aspect of the matter, though there are incidental items of treatment elsewhere in the book. This simple analysis will serve to put the reader in touch with the method of treatment. It may be designated quite accurately as a discussion of the rationality of the Virgin Birth statement in the light of the total significance of Jesus and His influence. Dr. Magoun describes his method thus:

“As the difficulties are largely rationalistic, it has seemed best to attack them from that angle. Throughout the book, therefore, rational grounds have been adhered to in the discussion. The argument has not been weakened by that plan, even if some may think it is not the best line of approach.” (Preface.)

The disadvantages of this method are at once apparent. Dr. Magoun's critics will at once accuse him of being dominated throughout by a “dogmatic” interest. A discussion of the Virgin Birth, primarily not a doctrine, but if a fact at all a fact in history verified by testimony and established by documentary evidence, which begins with the doctrine of the Trinity and ends with the doctrine of the cross and shows throughout that the Virgin Birth statement fits in with the rest of this scheme of interpretation, may be presumed to know where it is going when it starts out. As a presumably disinterested scientific investigation of a difficult historical problem it is compromised at the very beginning. The author is, of course, quite aware of this fact and accepts the limitation of his method. So far as

the book itself is concerned, it is apologetic and argues from a foregone conclusion.

And yet any fair minded critic will at once agree that the author's foregone conclusion has itself been arrived at by a thoroughgoing process of thought and study. As the author himself says (again in the unpagged Preface) that, as a sort of resultant of personal doubts and the questionings of a friend, he reached the conclusion, that "evidently the thing must be thought through to a finish, omitting nothing."

On the other hand, Dr. Magoun's method has certain distinct advantages to those whose minds are not closed on the subject. It is quite evident that no historical question which involves the weighing of evidence and the careful valuation of testimony can be canvassed in a vacuum; that is, without reference to the large issues involved. Occasionally the most doughty rationalist finds himself in presence of testimony which *qua* rationalist he cannot reject without making himself what old Trader Horn calls "Homo Stultus," yet the acceptance of which leads to conclusions which he intensely dislikes. He may take Professor Gardner's easy way out and say, "History cannot be made this way," and yet it leaves a gnawing doubt in the mind, for history can easily be unmade by the overuse of incredulity. There must be room in the time-stream for what is new, unprecedented, and even essentially unique, or progress becomes impossible and the universe stalls in its very first stages. We must find room in our cosmos for radium, for life, for man, and for Jesus, each one *in its own class* and unique.

It is moreover clearly impossible to discuss the Virgin Birth as if it were an isolated question standing apart from the personality of Jesus. It is absurd to discuss parthenogenesis in the abstract, with all the factors which make Jesus the unique phenomenon which He clearly is, *left out*. We must remember that we are discussing the birth of Jesus, not parthenogenesis as a general proposition. Dr. Magoun does well, therefore, in relating the whole matter of Jesus' personality, self-consciousness, and influence to the question of His birth, and

in showing that the student has other questions to answer and other problems to solve before the career of Jesus can be vacated of unique and distinctive factors. Those who will readily slip through the meshes of this argument are those who admit what Dr. Magoun says about the personality of Jesus and who yet feel that all this does not necessarily imply a miraculous uniqueness in the mode of His birth. These successful evaders are perhaps to be caught by his argument, that the spiritual uniqueness of Jesus must be harmonized with the dread alternative presented in the title of the book.

Another point comes up for emphasis here. Dr. Magoun is quite aware that the deniers of the Virgin Birth are no more working in a vacuum than he is. They start out with pre-suppositions and rational difficulties which control, or at least modify, their treatment of the critical problem. If the thinker's difficulty is with the divinity of Christ and begins with the doctrine of the Trinity (see ch. II), then the Trinity must be adequately and thoughtfully discussed. If the trouble is with the question of miracles, then that question must be discussed.

It is evident, therefore, that the question of the Virgin Birth can never be adequately discussed as a purely historical question, or on critical grounds alone. It enters into the whole matter of the significance of Jesus to the church and the world.

On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that any fact which is vital to the understanding and interpretation of Jesus could possibly be doubtfully historical and lacking in documentary attestation. It could hardly be doctrinally vital and at the same time historically dubious. It must, therefore, be a legitimate subject of critical inquiry—important enough to justify the best that scholarship can do in the way of investigation. Dr. Magoun's contribution to this phase in the inquiry is too important to be dismissed with a gesture of depreciation, simply because it is the work of a convinced believer in the higher Christology.

I recommend for especially careful consideration the two chapters already mentioned on the relationship of Joseph to Jesus and on the two genealogies. Dr. Magoun has taken more

pains than anyone of whom I am aware to make clear the meaning of the texts both of Matthew and of Luke, to show how integral a part of both texts the birth stories are, and to show how stoutly they both resist all attempts to account for them as either interpolations or late insertions. These two hypotheses are the only available methods of separating the birth stories from the remainder of these two Gospels and of breaking the twofold testimony without disintegrating the rest of the witness of these two writers.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

UNDERSTANDING THE APOSTLES' CREED ⁴

WHILE the conservative reader may not accept all the conclusions of this book, it will be granted that Dr. McFayden has been at great pains to arrive at them. Into his life, while reciting the Credo during a service, came that question which has occurred to most of us, "What do I mean by what I am saying?" Out of his effort to answer it came the title of his book.

The author has searched the records of early Christianity for the solution of his problem. He extended his quest through early Christianity—the Christianity of St. Paul, St. John, the Gnostics, and Marcion—to find the roots of the Credo in the Old Roman Symbol. In his two concluding chapters Dr. McFayden shows the relation of the Creed and science and finally seeks to evaluate the authority of creeds.

The Old Roman Symbol reads:

"I believe in God, Father, Almighty:

"And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord; who was born of [the] Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin; who was crucified in the time of Pontius Pilate, and buried, and on the third day rose from among the dead, ascended into the heavens, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence He is to come to judge living and dead:

"And in [the] Holy Spirit, Holy Church, remission of sins, a resurrection of the flesh."

⁴ Understanding the Apostles' Creed. By Donald McFayden, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xiv+318.

The Apostles' Creed:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, *Maker of heaven and earth*:

"And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; who was *conceived* by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, *suffered* under Pontius Pilate, was crucified *dead* and buried, *He descended into hell*, the third day He rose from the dead, He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of *God* the Father *Almighty*, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead:

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, *the communion of saints*, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, *and the life everlasting*."

In his chapter on the exegesis of the Symbol and Creed he treats separately every statement made in each and explains why other words have been included in the later Creed than were found in the Symbol. He here seeks to interpret the meaning of these statements in the light of the knowledge and understanding of that day.

The Old Roman Symbol was most likely a second century document; the Creed, we are told, took its present form possibly as late as the ninth century. In the first century there really was no place for a uniform expression of faith because of the original ideas and vivid experiences which were so varied. Gradually it became necessary at the time of baptism to ask uniform questions about the faith of the candidate. Then, too, by re preaching Christianity, just as by relecturing on certain subjects, a defined syllabus appeared with outstanding topics in a logical order. The first traces of Symbol and Creed, then, were those of a standard of faith by which to protect the church from such as might still have in their minds the roots of pagan thought.

To understand any creed we must determine the bearing of its assertions upon life. Here we find its permanent values, for here it touches human nature. One could believe that Jesus descended into hell, in the medieval sense, and be strengthened, because Jesus went before him even unto death. This merely means that Jesus went into the middle state of spirits, according

to medieval thought. It is not a doctrinal assertion of the existence of Hades. Everyone of that day assumed its existence.

Dr. McFayden takes much time to tell of the Aristotelian conception of the universe prevalent in the early centuries of the history of the church. Jewish contributions to the religion of mankind include conviction of the love of God, the identification of religion with morality, monotheism, and individual religion coupled with the conception of a church. In the first and second centuries men universally accepted their Jewish traditions and believed in the Aristotelian world.

A careful reading of the Old Roman Symbol will show it to be nothing but a summarized statement of the preaching of the first apostles, and so we are not far afield when we speak of the Apostles' Creed. It is surely a second century product, for we find God a universal Father rather than a God of Israel. The imminence of Christ's return and the glories of the coming age are waning. No mention is made of the Atonement, and there is no summary of the ethical revelations of Jesus. The Virgin Birth too is mentioned, which the author regards as unknown before the second century in the Christian message.

The author defends Gnosticism as actually helping some men, on the ground that it was a religion and has so to be interpreted. It was not a plain philosophy, for its object was not merely knowledge, but salvation through knowledge. The Gnostics were the Modernists of the second century. Dr. McFayden also sees the defect of narrowness in the Gnostics who despised common human interests and activities.

The original text of the Symbol and the building up and arranging of the Creed to the ninth century are largely conjectural. He believes that the old Symbol does not assert a faith in the Virgin Birth. He is pronounced in his statement that we must not confuse what a creed asserts with what it assumes. Everyone, says he, accepted that Jesus was genuinely born, but the compilers of the early statements surely assumed His divine parenthood.

"The Church," Dr. McFayden says, "is holy in the sense of being a divinely founded institution for making men holy."

He continues that the church is the guardian and teacher of the faith delivered to the saints and is strongly opposed to heretical sects which by teaching a corrupted faith are emasculating the Christian life.

It does not detract from the value of the Symbol to say that it is the oldest Fundamentalist document which we possess. By Fundamentalism he means the effort to perpetuate the Christian life of the past by resisting any change in the ideas by which the saints of the past were inspired. The Symbol tried to bind the early church to the original Jewish form of Christianity and tried to prevent inroads of the Hellenistic thought by which the church was surrounded. The author strikes to the root of the matter when he implies that what really retards the progress of the Christian faith is the hesitation of men to accept it because of the demands which it makes on them. It does not take much of a man to be a Christian, but it takes all of him.

The Symbol makes no mention of the ethical revelations of Jesus, but Dr. McFayden believes that they were given to candidates for baptism separately. Likewise the Symbol missed some of the values of the primitive Gospel and was obsolete before it was composed. It ignored the divinity of Christ which truth its own age was trying so hard to formulate. It also omits the vicarious atonement, although it mentions Christ's death. The Symbol makes no mention of the Messianic hope which the Creed touches in "life everlasting."

A history of what the Creed has meant to each succeeding century is largely a history of misinterpretation. Infallibility has now been replaced by a susceptibility of reinterpretation in terms of any truth which may be discovered. This process takes time and many have their faith shaken in the meanwhile, but the church, which has as its aim the bringing of men to God and not the perpetuation of a single doctrine or denomination, always moves forward. Institutions may and must be damaged that men may be helped.

Until recent years the Creed was held inerrant by all save the Unitarians. The scientific spirit which the church has

applied to religion, the author thinks, has made churchmen more open-minded and consequently more Christian than ever. The fallacy has been that we have thought of religious certainties as scientific facts and theories when they have been in an entirely separate category. Christianity is most practical, but is not to be tested by the formulae of science, for she does not deal with this kind of stuff. Science can neither prove nor disprove religious truth. History as history and science as science know neither God nor a divine purpose. Philosophy has attempted to gather all truth and see reality as a whole. That task is too great for us as yet.

Christianity is most practical. Men who hold to Christian faith and live by it become better. The proof of Christian doctrine is that it works. The function of theology is to determine and set forth the faith which men need if they are to realize their noblest possibilities. Now theology, like all sciences, possesses some elements of permanence, and here is the value of the Symbol and the Creed. No other form for liturgical use can be suggested that can take the place of the Creed to show the pathway that men have trod to our Christianity. We yearn that the Creed may be retained and that men may not think of harming their intellectual integrity in subscribing to it, but that more and more we may come to see that by its recitation we are brought into contact with the faith of Christianity's Golden Age. When we have thus caught the value of the contribution of this early church production we can teach it to our children with no stigma upon it because of ancient form but with new life because of a better understanding of our religion so richly blessed by our fathers in the faith.

R. W. ALBRIGHT.

OUR JEWISH NEIGHBORS ⁵

A SURPRISINGLY large number of books upon the Jews have appeared within the past year or two. Some of this matter is by

⁵ Our Jewish Neighbors: An Essay in Understanding. By John Stuart Conning, D.D., Superintendent of Jewish Evangelization, Board of National Missions, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. Introduction by Dr. Charles R. Erdman. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1927. Bibliography. Index.

Jews themselves. These volumes deal to a great extent with the religious differences and relationships between Christians and Jews.

The very fact that such a literature has developed is an evidence of a changing attitude along the line of religious contact between the two races concerned. It can hardly be due chiefly to any sudden and notable activity on the part of the Christian church toward the members of the synagogue and the temple. Rather both Christian and Jew are waking up to the fact that a change is coming over the Jews as they are more and more brought into contact with their Gentile fellow-citizens. This is true especially in those regions where the younger generation of Jews knows nothing of active persecution, but where they have the full civil rights of other citizens. We find that a considerable section of the race is breaking away from the traditional religious faith, at least in its fulness. With this has come an unrest and a disposition to look into Christianity with less prejudice.

All this means a great opportunity—and responsibility—for the church. But there must be definite, clear, and reliable information, and it is to aid in meeting this need that Dr. Conning has written this informing little book. His official positions, as superintendent of Jewish evangelization in his church, and as chairman of the committee on the Hebrews, Interdenominational Home Missions Council, give his words special weight. Furthermore he has the advantage of years of personal experience in cultivating friendliness between Christians and Jews.

It is not often that a book of distinctly religious character and purpose has been made so fascinating. Though a small volume, the author has succeeded in placing before his readers the essential and significant facts in the character and story of the Hebrew people. Even to educated Christians many of his statements will come as new and revealing items of history. Take these two quotations:

“When, finally, Ferdinand of Castile brought Moorish

power to an end, he made a decree, in 1492, banishing all Jews from Spain and confiscating their property" (p. 23).

"Tradition credits the equipment of the caravels for the expedition to the generosity of Queen Isabella who sold her jewels for the purpose. Historians have shown that this was a mere invention intended to glorify the queen. The real financiers of the voyage were Luis de Santangel, a Jew, and two of his Jewish friends. Moreover, it was a Jewish scholar, Abraham Zacuto, who prepared the astronomical tables which Columbus used, and two Jews, Levi ben Gerson and Jacob ben Machir, who prepared the instruments for taking observations which made the voyage of Columbus possible.

"If we care to inquire why Jews took so large an interest in the voyage of the great discoverer, we are reminded at once of the desperate condition of the Spanish Jews at that very time. The cruel decree of expulsion from Spain for all Jews who refused to renounce their faith and accept Catholicism was then in effect. Tens of thousands of Jews were in flight to any land where there was any hope of finding a refuge. They were enduring unspeakable hardships. Thousands were captured by pirates and sold as slaves. The very kith and kin of Santangel and his associates were in peril. Must it not have entered into the minds of these far-seeing men that in the expedition of Columbus there was the possibility of finding somewhere beyond the Western Sea a land of refuge where their sorely tried brethren might be ensured the right to life and liberty? The best evidence of this motive in their support of Columbus' undertaking is the fact that no sooner was America discovered than large numbers of Jews flocked to the new-found lands beyond the sea." (P. 27 f.)

The result of the lure of America for the Jews is considered in some detail, tables being given to show the number drawn from each of the countries from which they have come and their distribution in the United States. The importance of the whole subject is evident when we are shown that 1,750,000 Jews live in New York City alone, forming approximately a third of the city's population. Moreover, they are not only successful in business, but reach high rank in the arts and professions.

The author raises the question, whether our Jewish population will cause history to repeat itself here in persecutions

of this wonderful but long-suffering race. It is shown how conditions of life in this country have operated to change the very outlook upon life for thousands of Jews. Read this, from the chapter, *Whither Bound?*

"As a result of these varied influences a multitude of Jews have slipped the old moorings and have yielded themselves to the moving tides of life about them, accepting the situation as part of the price which they must pay for liberty. Uncertain of their course, they are venturing out upon all sorts of strange and untried paths. It is this aimless drift which constitutes the real Jewish peril of our time. The abandonment of a religion as highly ethical as Judaism has resulted in a distinct lowering of moral standards. The Jews are fast losing their pre-eminence as a moral and law-abiding people." (P. 50.)

A whole chapter is given to *The Daughters of Israel*. The latter part of the book is devoted to the religious problem and its solution. Here is presented the revolutionary change now taking place in the Jewish mind respecting Christ, the increasing willingness to read the New Testament, and the principles upon which the Christian can effectively present his message to his Jewish neighbor.

"Modern psychologists have shown that by the process of rationalizing, as distinguished from reasoning, 'reasons' are always found or invented for any dislike which is cherished, or antagonism which is followed. Here we reach the root of the difficulty between the Jew and the Gentile." (P. 89.)

"One who has not learned to be patient with the uncharitable, to be kind to the thankless, and to love the unlovable has not journeyed far with Christ. This is the only means by which the reign of prejudice can be broken and Christianity be really interpreted to the Jew." (P. 95.)

This book should be in the hands of our pastors, especially those located where there is a numerous Hebrew population. It should also be included in the home mission study classes of our evangelical churches generally, for it has been written with no denominational bias. Our churches deeply need just what Dr. Conning so ably and hopefully shows in prospect:

"The acceptance of Jesus by Jews would bring into the

ancient faith not only what would give meaning to its history and reality to its ideals, but also introduce the vitality and spiritual power which it lacks. What we might hope for by such a movement would be a distinctive type of Christian discipleship. The possibilities of Christ's boundless life have never been fully realized by Gentile Christians, perhaps never can be. What might not we expect if Jews laid hold of evangelical truth and gave full allegiance to Jesus as Saviour and Lord? One can imagine no greater gift to humanity than that spiritual power which inheres in Christianity when it takes possession of the whole mind and heart of the race of Jesus." (P. 146 f.)

ROBERT M. KURTZ.